Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 57 ST. LOUIS NOVEMBER 1929

FROM THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY TO THE RELIGION OF GOD

By Dr. H. R. Niebuhr

"We advance inevitably from a religion of humanity to a religion of God," the words are not quoted from a theologian but from a psychologist, William Brown of Oxford. They may be taken as the motto not only of the experience of many a devout man but also of a tendency in modern thought as a whole. There is good reason for the belief that a new age of faith is at hand; or, if that is too optimistic a conclusion, it is yet evident that fewer theoretical difficulties will be placed in the path of faith in the future than has been the case since the beginning of the nineteenth century.

In support of this thesis two main tendencies in modern thinking may be described: the tendency in theology and philosophy of religion and the tendency in natural science. There are, of course, other movements in the modern world which make it more susceptible to religious influences than it once was. Among these the primary place is occupied by man's disillusionment with himself. It may be that this is the most fundamental of all characteristics of the contemporary intellectual climate. For pride and human self-sufficiency are the arch-enemies of faith and when these go both the possibility and the need of faith may enter the soul once more. The pride of the nineteenth and early twentieth century in the achievements of men, the sophomoric vainglory of popularized science, the arrogance of democracy have all been chastened not

only by the tremendous experience of the world war but by the sober second thought which reveals limitations unattended to by civilization in the period of its expansion, and insufficiencies unacknowledged by an adolescent culture in its years of discovery.

In science, political and cultural life a new humility has manifested itself which cannot but ultimately affect the popular temper and be conducive to the reassertion of religious faith. For the present, it is true, the pride in human achievement, which leaves no room for religion, and the contentment with a present world of material comforts, which does not allow the restlessness of the soul for God to come to expression, still prevail among large masses. The temper of the popular mind is frequently determined by the temper of the scientific mind in the previous generation; leading ideas require a long time to work down into the social consciousness; the practical results of the scientific labor of one generation do not become apparent until much later, for applied science necessarily lags years behind theory, while it is this applied science which influences the popular psychology most effectively. The effectiveness of the new tendencies in theology and philsophy of religion upon the one hand and in natural science and philosophy upon the other hand may not become apparent for many years, yet their appearance is significant for the future.

I

The advance from a religion of humanity to a religion of God is strikingly manifested in the changes which have taken place in theology during the last ten years. The culture of the nineteenth century was in almost every respect anthropocentric. Its interest in man as the measure of all things came to expression in the great democratic movements which, starting with the American and French Revolutions, culminated in the Russian Revolution and which, in the interval of more than a hundred years, democraticized almost all the nations of the earth. This same interest in man, in his emotions, in the subjective aspects of his experience was revealed in literature, where the romantic tradition replaced the classic. From "Werther" on the literature of the nineteenth century was under the influence of this anthropocentric point of view. The psychological novel, as illustrated in English literature by Henry James, by Hardy and even by Conrad, ego-centric poetry as exemplified by Browning, Francis Thompson and Tennyson's "In Memoriam," has been followed in our own time by the psychological biography. The extreme forms of the arts, from music to sculpture, betrayed the same concentration upon the emotions and impressions and expressions of the self. Objective standards everywhere were replaced by subjective standards.

This spirit of nineteenth century civilization was partly expressed in, partly derived from its philosophy. The philosophy of the period was anthropocentric with a vengeance. The dominant school was the idealistic school which found its starting point or the fulcrum from which it sought to move the world in the dictum of Descartes, "I think, therefore I am." Berkeley, Hume and Kant with all their followers in England and Germany could not emancipate themselves from this point of view. Experience was regarded everywhere as the key to knowledge and the decisive thing about experience was that it was the experience of a subject. With Hegel and Hegelianism this point of view became the source of a great *Weltanschauung* in which the whole world was regarded from the interior point of view and human experience of self-consciousness was made the pattern of the universe.

Theology under the influence of the general *Zeitgeist* and, especially, under the guidance of philosophy followed the dominant tendency. Romanticism and idealistic philosophy met in Schleiermacher who defined the essence of religion in the highly subjective terms of feeling and the content of theology in the psychological terms of Christian consciousness. To quarrel with historical tendencies and to criticize Schleiermacher for what was in his day a most necessary and highly fruitful discovery is as unnecessary as it is unjustified. Certainly Schleiermacher's contribution remains of supreme importance. But, like all theological insights it was influenced by the temper of the times and it was one-sided. The human aspect of religion, as the only one available for analysis, alone came to expression and from this time onward to our own day theology remained under the influence of an anthropocentric point of view. The heresies of a period are as enlightening for the understanding of its character as are its orthodoxies, for usually heresies are simply the completely rationalized, extreme developments of some item of orthodox belief. The heresies of the nineteenth century, if one may use that phrase, came to light in Strauss and Feuerbach. In the latter especially the anthropocentric tendencies of the nineteenth century were illustrated in their extreme form. For Feuerbach the only possible view of religion was the psychological view. Theology is anthropology, the gods are wish-beings; but one factor is present in religion—the human; human experience, human wishes, human feelings these are the factors which make up faith.

A more adequate but still anthropocentric point of view was expressed in the pragmatic theology of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century and in those forms of the social gospel which are most akin to pragmatism. The question which was

raised in these schools was the question as to the human value of religion. Religion was defended because it is serviceable to the mundane life of man. Even American Lutheranism succumbed to this tendency when it advertised itself in the days of the "Great Red Scare" as an antidote to Bolshevism and, by implication, a safe-guarder of property. In some highly provincial forms of the social gospel Christianity in particular and religion in general are regarded as exclusively ethical, exclusively mundane, exclusively human endeavors. Again, as in the case of Schleiermacher, there is an obvious truth in the claim that faith has a social task as well as some social origins, but the one-sided emphasis indicates the pre-occupation of the period with man and his mundane values. The most important of the contemporary manifestations of this nineteenth century and anthropocentric point of view are to be found in the field of psychology and sociology of religion, where the sociological rather than the ethical and the psychological rather than the empirical interests of modern times meet. Such a work as Ames' recent "Religion" falls completely within the category of anthropocentric theology. Following his masters, Durkheim and Levy-Bruhl, Ames regards religion as the purely human enterprises of pursuing purely human values and believes that its nature can be explained completely without reference to any objective Deity solely by reference to psychology, sociology and ethics.

This anthropocentric theology which remains symptomatic of the past century though it continues to manifest itself so late as 1929, has its undoubted values, historically and intrinsically. Historically its value lies in the rediscovery of the inner life in religion and of the social task of faith. It was a most desirable and necessary revolt against the intellectualism of Deism and Orthodoxy which both found the essence of faith in the acceptance of intellectually formulated beliefs. Intrinsically the value of the anthropocentric tendency lies in its reassertion of the ethical factors in religion, in its emphasis upon practical activity, in its cultivation of an inner piety of feeling, and in its development of an adequate critical apparatus by means of which men are better able to examine and to criticise both their own ethical and religious life and the ethical and doctrinal mixture of philosophy and religion, of social and Christian ethics which prevails in all institutional and historical forms of the faith. But the deficiencies and evils of an anthropocentric theology have also become apparent. In its extreme forms it robbed men of the consciousness of God, substituted auto-suggestion for prayer, pursuit of values for devotion to God and self-help for salvation.

II

Hence the reaction against the subjective point of view which has set in in theology is to be warmly welcomed by all for whom religion means not only the seeking after God but His self-revelation also, not only pursuit of values but also obedience to the Divine Will, not only striving but also trust and assurance, not only the energizing of the will but also its salvation, not only the Kingdom of God in its social aspects but also immortality and redemption. This reaction has undoubtedly set in. Perhaps the year 1918 may be taken as the year of the turning point in theology, when from a religion of humanity it moved inevitably again toward the religion of God.

The closing years of the world-war were marked by the publication in Germany of Otto's "Das Heilige" and Barth's "Roemerbrief," in America of Macintosh's "Theology as an Empirical Science," in England of Streeter's and his associates' studies. All the movements which have been influenced by these publications or their authors have one element in common—the re-emphasis upon God as the fundamental factor in faith and of the revelation or knowledge of God as the essential element in religion. This is not the place to examine the very wide differences between the positions occupied by the various men mentioned. Some of these are due to differences of background and terminology. One reason why German and Anglo-Saxon theology seem to vary so greatly is that they build upon entirely different philosophical foundations. The term "empiricism," for instance, has an entirely different connotation in German thinking than it has in Anglo-Saxon philosophy. It makes a great deal of difference whether nations have thought for a century in the terms of Kant or in the terms of Locke. They may be much nearer to each other in essentials than they believe but their kinship is hidden because they speak different languages even when they employ the socalled precise terms of philosophy or theology. Despite specious and real distinctions, however, there is this common note in the new theology—the insistence upon the fact that in religion the primary element is God, not man and that in faith there is actual commerce with the Father. For the new German theology this position demands the rejection of empiricism; for American and, in part, for English theology it requires the reinterpretation of experience from a realistic point of view. In the nineteenth century experience, including religious experience, was examined from the point of view of the subject. The psychological and perhaps logical aspects were analyzed but toward the thing-in-itself, that which was experienced, a negative agnostic attitude seemed alone possible. Today realism is in the saddle

as much as subjectivism once was. The temper of the times demands realism in literature and art as well as in science, and theology is profiting by this general reversal. Empirical realism of this sort may, it is true, be so cautious as to make very little advance on the idealistic or psychological empiricism of a previous generation. Such a cautious and inadequate realism is presented in the works of Wieman, who maintains the independent reality of God but proceeds then to define God in terms which allow for the interpretation of almost any kind of dependence upon the world as religious. In Macintosh realistic empiricism is much more adequate and more realistic. It is the contention of Macintosh's theology that men know God as they know any other reality, for instance the reality of other persons. Within the complex of sensations which the subject experiences when he sees another person he directly intuits, knows, the reality of that other. So within the experience of salvation, man intuits God. Religious experience is primarily an experience of God, though it is also the experience possessed by a subject. Such experience is at once revelation and discovery. From the purely human point of view it is discovery, but the man who experiences God in the answer to prayer experiences him as active, self-revealing will. Because men may know God directly, as the dependable factor on which they can count for salvation when they make the right adjustment to him,—that is the adjustment which Christ has made possible,—therefore it is possible for theology to become an empirical science which will describe the Object which appears in the experience of salvation as astronomy describes the object which appears in our experience of the stars. There is a tremendous difference, of course, between the inactive object of astronomical experience and the living God of religious experience but this is common to both types—that in them an object independent of all human wishes, of all purely psychological elements comes to appearance. By making religious experience at its best rather than religious experience in its least developed forms the source of knowledge about God Macintosh is able to go far beyond Wieman in his theological theory. The God who seeks men and who responds to them when they come to Him in the spirit of Christ is not only a dependable factor, but an evidently personal God of love. Macintosh's theory, by the way, must be judged primarily by reference to the book named above rather than by reference to the apologetic work on "The Reasonableness of Christianity."

In German theology the theocentric tendency is most pronounced. It is so pronounced in fact that it is almost possible to speak of a theo-centric predicament in the Barthian theology com-

parable to the ego-centric predicament of romantic theology. For while the anthropocentric theology of the nineteenth century began with man and then discovered that it was very difficult to find a way from man to God, so the theo-centric theology of Barth and his followers begins with God and finds it hard to discover a way from God to man. Eventually it is forced to rely more on the Logos doctrine than on the Jesus Christ of the New Testament and on metaphysics rather than on the history of salvation. The predicament in which each type of theology is placed illustrates simply the chasm which exists between life and intellect and the danger to which thinking leads when it sets up one absolute principle and seeks consistently to follow out its implications to their rational consequences. The mystery and the power of Christianity seem always to have resided in the tension between dual principles and in the movement of life back and forth between these poles rather than in the consistent application of a single idea. This tension, irrational but fruitful, is illustrated in the Trinitarian and Chalcedonian formulae, in the emphasis upon God's unity and God's diversity, on Christ's humanity and deity, in the further hiatus between divine justice and divine mercy. The Barthian emphasis upon the majesty of God, on His over-poweringness and sole reality, on Christ the Logos rather than on the Jesus of history, betray the movement into a difficult position in which many of the values of the Christian faith are imperilled. But with all these difficulties and dangers—and what great theology is without its perils?—there is in this new German movement the great, hopeful, realistic note of emphasis upon the absolute objectivity and reality of God.

This is the tendency which characterizes the new theology, whether in Germany, America or England. And as theology is always responsive to the temper of its times so this theology is significant of a new temper in religion—of a new emphasis which is yet the old emphasis, namely that faith is life in God and not within the confines of human consciousness. Whether or not this theology will become as one-sided in its emphasis as nineteenth century thought was remains to be seen. For the present that danger exists, but no new movement, it seems, can make its contribution to the truth without over-emphasizing and so distorting the truth. There is need today as always of quiet and well-balanced minds which will refuse to fall into the apparently courageous but over-zealous, and dangerous attitudes of an "ether-or" theology or philosophy and which will endeavor to continue the less spectacular but truer task of finding the meaning which resides in the antinomies of the religious life and of doctrine.

III

The movement from a religion of humanity to a religion of God is not confined to theology. In secular philosophy a similar tendency is manifesting itself. In part this tendency is due to that greater appreciation of the reality of religion which has made itself manifest in scientific circles since the days when James' "Varieties of Religious Experience" was first published; in part the tendency is due to the unsatisfactory nature of the conclusions to which an irreligious philosophy was forced; in part it derives from the new developments within science itself.

Biology, to take up one example, has gone a long way from the position occupied by Haeckel. In Driesch, J. A. Thomson, Coulter and many others, in the philosophies of Bergson, Hobhouse, Schiller and James the mechanistic hypotheses of an earlier day have disappeared and the *Weltanschauung* which builds upon the basis of the concept of evolution either shows its need of or provides a definite place for a theistic interpretation of the progress of life.

It is the new physics, however, which more than anything else is overthrowing the mechanistic, godless world-views of an earlier day, which is restoring humility to the list of scientific virtues and which is showing forth again the reasonableness or necessity for belief in God, from a purely intellectual point of view. The extent to which modern physics has overcome its mechanistic antecedents and tends in its philosophic moments to extend a welcome to the religious interpretation of the universe is indicated especially in the recent Gifford lectures of the great English astronomer, A. S. Eddington. The final conclusions of his examination of the new physics are worth quoting:

"(1) The symbolic nature of the entities of physics is generally recognized; and the scheme of physics is now formulated in such a way as to make it almost self-evident that it is a partial aspect of something wider.

"(2) Strict causality is abandoned in the material world. Our ideas of the controlling laws are in process of reconstruction and it is not possible to predict what kind of form they will ultimately take; but all indications are that strict causality has dropped out permanently. This relieves the former necessity of supposing that mind is subject to deterministic law or alternatively that it can suspend deterministic law in the material world.

"(3) Recognizing that the physical world is entirely abstract and without 'actuality' apart from its linkage to consciousness, we restore consciousness to the fundamental position instead of repre-

senting it as an inessential complication occasionally found in the midst of inorganic nature at a large stage in evolutionary history.

"(4) The sanction for correlating a 'real' physical world to certain feelings of which we are conscious does not seem to differ in any essential respect from the sanction for correlating a spiritual domain to another side of our personality" (Nature of the Physical World, p. 331-332).

It is at the latter point that this new tendency in science differs from the rationalism of the eighteenth century in its efforts to prove the existence of God by means of man's experience of nature. The tendency which Eddington represents and which many scientists share with him is simply that of recognizing the limitations of their science and of acknowledging the validity of religious perceptions.

Yet secular philsophy today indicates its interest in the theistic world-view by reviving natural theology as well as by showing the inadequacy of mechanism and the validity of religious experience. In so eminent a scientist and philosopher as Whitehead as well as in Alexander the return to the concept of God as a necessary philosophical concept becomes pronounced. It can be objected that such natural theologies do not give us God, but at best some pale and abstract principle, like Whitehead's "principle of concretion" or Alexander's "principle of emergence," which is far removed from the God and Father of religion and theology. The objection is doubtless justified if anyone seeks to substitute the scientific principle for the religious object but if the scientific principle is regarded as the discovery of one aspect of Deity, an aspect available to philosophy without recourse to religion, then these approaches to theistic philosophy can only be welcomed as verifications from another realm of experience of that which is most manifestly and fully revealed in faith.

These are some of the signs of the times. They indicate that the brief period of modern culture's adolescence is over. Pride in human achievement and reliance upon human power alone, the idolatry of science and romantic pre-occupation with the self and its feelings are giving way to a chastened yet illuminated mood. "We advance inevitably from a religion of humanity to a religion of God."

THE CHURCH IN POLITICS

By Professor Philip Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D.
Palmyra, N. J.

During last year's presidential campaign the ancient bogey of "the parson in politics" was raised once more, in order to frighten and browbeat timid church leaders. As this controversy is still going on a discussion of the subject of this article seems very timely. And since we constantly meet with unintentional confusion as well as with intentional misrepresentation in discussing this question, we shall attempt to give a somewhat detailed analysis of the various aspects involved in the problem, the more so as some features of the controversy overlap to some extent.

The Meaning of the Term "Politics"

Let us first of all have a clear idea of what we mean by "politics." The term is derived from the Greek word, polis, city or state, and has, as at present used in America, three meanings. First it denotes the science of government, that is, that part of social ethics which has to do with the administration of a state or a smaller community; the preservation of its safety, peace and prosperity, the protection of the rights of the citizens and the improvement of their morals. Secondly, the term politics has reference to the organization and management of a political party, the declaration of its principles in platforms as well as the nomination and election of its candidates. Thirdly, the word politics is very generally used to designate all sorts of dishonesty, corrupt methods and trickery practiced by unscrupulous persons to capture positions of political influence and to accumulate wealth. This bad meaning of the term "politics" has become so general that most people know no other. They talk of "dirty politics." There are indeed "dirty politicians," but "politics," in its true sense, is a noble and sacred activity.

It goes without saying that in the question Shall the Church be in politics? the term is understood in its first and higher sense. For true Christians are of course wholly opposed to a church, as a corporate body, going into politics in the sense of allying itself with any political party or faction, or resorting to the methods of partisan campaign, using any sort of political threat or external coercion, least of all taking part in trickery and corruption to reach certain ends. It is one thing to bring party politics and economic theories into the range of Church activity. It is a vastly different thing to bring the forces of religious conviction and experience into action in our social and political life.

Party politics pollute religion, but religion purifies politics.

Bishop McConnell, in his recent excellent book, "Humanism and Christianity," writes: "Mr. Bryan, on one occasion, was pleading for higher and nobler political methods in American politics. A man in the audience called out, 'Ought we not fight the devil with fire?" to which Mr. Bryan replied good-humoredly: 'My friend, I don't believe I'd try to fight the devil with fire if I were you. In the first place, the devil knows more about fire than you do, and in the next place it costs him less for fuel.' Mr. Bryan might have added that the only way a man can become as effective as the devil in fighting with fire is to attain a devilish skill in such methods and by that time the humanity of the fire-user is considerably singed. Christianity's fighting the world is wholly legitimate so long as the methods are Christian. Anything beyond emphatic proclamation of Christ's unabridged gospel, including its social and political implications, any lobbying, propaganda and political maneuvers must be rigidly subjected to prophetic scrutiny. The Church has made the sorriest messes of things, and the worst exhibition of herself, when she has tried to use the world's weapons against the world."

The Duty and Inevitableness of the Church in Politics

But, granted that the churches should use only clean, honorable and absolutely ethical means in their attempts to influence the political affairs of the nation, the question is still being raised, Should the churches concern themselves at all with political questions in any sense and by the use of even the cleanest methods?

In this discussion, we use the term "church" in a comprehensive sense, including single denominations as well as federations of churches and individual congregations in their corporate capacity, also organizations closely connected with churches; such as brotherhoods, women's unions, young people's leagues, Sunday schools, Y. M. C. A.'s, Y. W. C. A.'s, as well as outstanding officials and prominent members of churches.

Many of the leaders of American church organizations have always believed that it is their *sacred duty* to extend the influence of Christ's gospel, directly and indirectly, to the political affairs of the nation. For if Christ's proclamation of the gospel *of the Kingdom,* which means the sovereignty of the divine will over all human affairs, if his teaching of the Golden Rule and the great commandment of love, if his insistence that his followers are to be the light of the world and the salt of the earth have any practical significance at all, if they are not merely Utopian dreams and unrealizable ideals, then the church of today has the plain duty to

urge the application of these principles, not only to the personal life of the individual but also to all social relations, including politics. When, years ago, the Dean of Westminster Abbey in London sharply criticized the atrocious behavior of British soldiers in some parts of India, the newspapers reminded him that political discussions had no place in such a sacred building; to which he vigorously replied that if there were any place in the world where denunciation of wrong politics belonged, it was certainly the Christian pulpit. Red-blooded ministers have always resented any curtailment of their rights of protest in the face of public wrong. Last year four Southern Methodist Bishops issued a declaration in which they say:

"It would be an unthinkable repudiation of our personal responsibility as Christian citizens and a base betrayal of those who have a right to look to us for moral leadership, to retire from the field at this critical juncture in the warfare with this age-long enemy of mankind. We notify the defenders of the liquor traffic that the moral forces of the country will not be driven from the field by the cry that they are bringing the Church into politics, by supporting a great reform for which they have not only as citizens, but also as Christian ministers, been working for years."

Another very recent illustration. It is known that most of the American churches have joined the pacific forces throughout the world, working for the abolition of the war system. Now, on Sept. 6, America was startled by a moral bombshell. President Hoover emphatically and even rather sensationally announced his determination to halt the work of paid propagandists and their employes who are seeking to defeat the Government to obtain world limitation of naval armaments. To that end he has instructed Attorney General Mitchell to investigate alleged relations between three of the largest shipbuilding companies in the country and W. B. Shearer, internationally known as a "big navy" propagandist. The President made it clear, in undertaking this investigation, his Administration was determined to rid the country of jingo influences which he said had been attempting secretly to block the movement toward naval reduction, upon which he has been working during the last three months. Shall the churches now suddenly retire from this field of agitation because limitation of armaments has become a *political* question? Absurd!

When party managers or special interests or corrupt politicians voice such a demand, we fully understand their reasons. They know that the moral principles stressed by the churches will cross their selfish plans. But when honorable citizens, having no corrupt or ulterior motives, and even leading churchmen, make the same demand, their action can only be explained as due to a num-

ber of misunderstandings, the first of which is a belief that the churches try to control politics in general and continuously. History, however, disproves such an assumption. As pointed out above, the church has never been in politics and never should be, in the sense of supporting parties or factions, or when purely economic and technical questions, such as the tariff or finance, etc., are the issues (though these, like all human affairs, have a moral side also). Only when great moral problems were before the nation, such as national independence, slavery, polygamy, war, temperance, marriage, etc., has the church considered it her sacred duty to make her influence felt in politics, for these problems touch the very vitals of the gospel message. The Church has taken sides on these questions for ages. You cannot expect an organization of about forty million members in America alone and about 600 millions throughout the world, with a history of 2000 years to keep silence on them now. You cannot say to these millions: "You churchmen had a right to publish your principles of political morality in an abstract way before they became issues of practical politics, but now you must stand back and allow "statesmen" alone to decide these things along party or factional or sectional lines. You no longer have the right to stress the group consciousness of the Church on these issues. Now you must revise Luther's famous declaration and act as if you thought: 'Here I once stood, but if the politicians so demand I *can* do otherwise.'" If the time should ever come when political ethics in America are settled by the Democratic Tammany Hall of New York, or the Republican "machines" of Philadelphia and Chicago, or by the more than fifty-seven varieties of special interests, then, in the words of Luther's prayer, "God help America!" People who demand that churchmen keep silent on politico-moral issues, know nothing of history, or psychology or the powerful urge of strong convictions.

Closely allied to the above confusion of mind is the assumption that only those churchmen who favor political reforms are in politics. The fact is, that every denomination and every church official and every outstanding church member is in politics, either affirmatively or negatively, whenever moral questions are at stake. They cannot help it; it is inevitable. Those churchmen who are silent and cautious when the waves of moral passion rise high, and those who openly oppose the reforms under consideration, are by their very silence or opposition almost as deeply in politics as the advocates of the reforms; only they are on the negative side, but taken sides they have. "For he who is not for me, is against me:" said our Lord. For example: During the anti-slavery agitation, not only abolitionist church men like Theo. Parker and Henry

Ward Beecher, but also the pro-slavery ministers, like Palmer of New Orleans and Van Dyke of Brooklyn, N. Y., as well as the many time-serving, silent and cautious men were all alike in politics on this great issue. And so today. Not only the advocates of an alcohol-free civilization in the churches, or of the outlawry of war, and of the application of Christ's gospel in business, are in politics, but also those denominations and individual churches that are silent or who denounce these reforms, have taken their stand in politics. Last week the Catholic Cardinal of Boston said to a reporter: "You may tell your readers that the Catholic Church is against prohibition." Such a declaration placed him and his church as deeply into politics on the prohibition question as the anti-saloon league is. So let no churchmen on the negative side of reforms deceive himself by supposing that he is really entitled to the praise that may come to him from certain groups: "Here is a denomination, or a minister, that keeps out of politics!" All shades of opinion are in politics.

This explanation also answers the oft-repeated question: "How is it that the Roman Catholic Church keeps out of politics? Why cannot Protestant churches follow her shining example?" The fact is that the Catholic church never has been, is not now, and never can be out of politics. (Read "Catholicism and the American Mind," by W. E. Garrison.) The only difference is that she uses secretive methods while Protestants employ the open democratic way of public discussion by word of mouth and literature. Only occasionally a prelate comes out into the open in the United States; but in the rest of the world the pope makes no secret of his political aspirations.

History of the Church in Politics

The utter impossibility of keeping the church out of politics is also confirmed by history. Of course the prophets, including John the Baptist, were all "political parsons," and so were their opponents, the so-called false prophets. If any one had asked them to stay out of the politics of their day, they would have regarded him in bewildered amazement, doubting whether he was in his right mind. And one who reads the New Testament without dogmatic spectacles cannot fail to be impressed with the political implications of the teaching and conduct of our Lord and His apostles. Christ's teaching on the kingship of God, his claim before Pilate that He is a king, the inscription over his cross, Peter's declaration that obedience to God precedes obedience to the state, Paul's "reasoning of righteousness and self-control and the judgment to come," before the licentious Roman governor Felix, the charge

against the Christians of "acting contrary to the decrees of Caesar, maintaining that there is another king, one Jesus" (Acts 17: 7)—these and hundreds of similar passages have a political content. History proves that the terrible persecutions of the Christians during the first three centuries were not due to their theology, but to the political and social implications of their religion. The Roman government clearly perceived the revolutionary character of Christ's gospel. "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." (Acts 17:6.) The conversion to Christianity of the Roman emperor Constantine the Great and his Toleration Edict of Milan in 311 meant that "the Galilean" had succeeded in morally conquering Rome and the political, and social changes throughout the empire which followed this conquest were tremendous, as shown by Brace, in his book "Gesta Christi" (The Deeds of Christ).

During the middle ages the Catholic Church not only influenced, but controlled politics, enthroning and dethroning kings and emperors. The Protestant Reformation opposed this papal tyranny, though Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Knox and others also insisted on the supremacy of the Divine law in politics. In the United States as stated before, the churches have only entered politics when great moral questions were at stake. The historian Bancroft says that in the Revolution of 1776 the pulpits became the tribunes of the common people. The pulpit was the most direct way to reach the masses. In his sermon on the Stamp Act, Dr. Mayhew fired the first gun of the Revolution. John Adams said that the pulpit of Lexington struck the first blow for American Independence. However, the Tories thought that the pulpits disgraced themselves by dabbling into politics not realizing that by so doing they themselves "dabbled in politics." In 1858 a petition by several hundreds of ministers in favor of the abolition of slavery was laid before the United States senate. Senator Douglas excoriated the preachers for assuming to be the mouthpiece of the deity. Promptly, a protest almost identical came from twenty-five ministers in the city of Chicago—the very center of the political strength of Douglas. Later, 504 preachers of the northwest joined in the same memorial. And from that hour, "the church in politics" became one of the never-ceasing denunciations thundered against the new agitation. But on the other side, abolition senators like Chase and Sumner encouraged the ministers to enter politics, saying,

"We implore Christians and Christian ministers to interpose. Their divine religion requires them to behold in every man a brother, and to labor for the advancement and regeneration of the human race." The response of the clergy had been instant. Three thousand and fifty ministers of New England signed a memorial to the senate which be-

gan: "In the name of Almighty God and in his presence, we solemnly protest against the passage of the pro slavery Nebraska bill."

But the pro-slavery ministers were also in politics, only on the other side. I have in my library a collection of sermons preached on the "day of fasting and prayer," Jan. 6, 1861, when civil war was impending, and in these one can read fiery defenses of slavery, calling it a "divine institution which must be maintained," by Dr. Palmer of New Orleans, Rev. Van Dyke of Brooklyn and others. So our history is full of "political parsons." But men like H. W. Beecher, Charles Parkhurst, Father Curran, archbishop of Ireland, and their kind did not preach to set brother against brother, but to set the right, as they saw it, against wrong.

Modern Methods of the Church in Politics

The methods pursued by the church in influencing political life were, and still are, different in different countries. We limit our discussion on this point to the United States in modern times.

1. In trying to cleanse politics most American churches insist that the most successful method consists in the conversion and growth in grace of the individual by repentance and faith, and in spiritualizing of family life. For in order to get cleaner politics an increasing number of the units of society must be cleansed to give them moral strength and vitality. A stream will never rise above its source. By this method the churches have admirably succeeded in training millions of people and thousands of outstanding leaders who in various ways discharge to some extent the mission of the church to be a light in the political world and the salt within our decaying civilization, and who, like the woman of old, mix into politics the leaven of the Gospel to "raise" them and make them more palatable. Should not the fact be placed to the credit of the Church that among the leaders of the Labor Party of England and Australia, and even among the Socialists of the European continent there are thousands who uphold Christian ideals in politics? How much faster the number and influence of such characters would grow in the world if the church were still more intent on teaching Christ's full and unabridged gospel.

2. Most American theological seminaries offer courses in the various branches of the social sciences in order to equip their ministers to preach Christ's gospel in the thought forms and language of our day. Much more of this is done in Europe, because there the "political and social shoe" pinches more severely. As there are great differences of opinion among theologians regarding Christs true conception of the kingdom of God and its bearing on present-day political and social conditions, up-to-date theological

schools should offer and require of each student at the very least one exegetical course on the social teaching of Christ, such as the value of personality, class distinctions, the Kingdom of God, marriage and divorce, the importance of the child, the moralization of the property idea, the perils of great wealth and of dire poverty, the limits of government control, on true and false patriotism, on war, etc.

3. Occasionally the American churches express their minds on burning political and social issues officially, by resolutions of their synods or in declarations by their leading office-bearers. (See "Social Pronouncements of the Ev. Synod") The churches have shown commendable wisdom in doing this very rarely. Fair-minded people should clearly distinguish between official declarations of a church as an organization, and the opinions of outstanding churchmen, given in their capacity as private church members or as American citizens. For example, when Bishop Connor, Jr. or Bishop McConnell or Dr. Cadman express political opinions, they must not be understood as speaking for their churches as corporate bodies. They speak for themselves or for a group of like-minded people, unless they bring to the attention of the public such official declarations on ethical principles which their respective churches have always stood for. We admit that to observe this nice distinction is difficult, but to make it is as fair to the church as it is in the case of a lawyer, a physician or an educator, etc. It is Russian and Mexican policy to muzzle a citizen politically if he happens to be a clergyman; but this is certainly not American.

4. Usually the churches discharge part of their political and social function by maintaining denominational *Commissions on Christianity and Social Problems,* headed by interdenominational and international social institutes. The work of these social commissions is often misunderstood and sometimes purposely misrepresented. It should be kept in mind that they have no pet political or economic program to promote, such as socialism, capitalism, single tax, etc. Their sole object is to use all available opportunities for the study of social and economic conditions and problems in order to assist their respective denominations to make a definite contribution to the social thought and progress of America which is in full harmony with the spirit and the principles of each Church. (See the report of our "Commission on Christianity and Social Problems" to our General Conference of 1929)

There was never a time when the American Churches were in greater need of social commissions than the present. When the whole world is grappling with perplexing social and political problems and when the European waves of radicalism are already dash-

ing upon the shores of America, it is brainless optimism, born of lack of historical perspective, to suppose that the United States and the American churches will be the only ones that shall remain untouched by the radical world upheavals. Church leaders who are inclined to be self-complacent will find much food for serious thinking in a recent book," Labor Speaks for Itself," by Professor Jerome Davis of Yale University, which is a symposium of the views of labor leaders throughout the world, and in which, for example, James P. Thompson, national organizer of the Industrial Workers of the World says:

"The established church has always been on the side of the rich and powerful. . . At one time or another they have asked God to bless nearly everything, from the slave-driver's lash to murderous wars. . . Today under capitalism they teach the working class the doctrine of humility; tell them if they get a slap on one cheek to turn the other—and 'blessed are the poor.' They tell us to bear the cross and wear the crown, that we will get back in the next world what is stolen from us in this. In other words they try to chloroform us with stories of heaven while the robbers plunder the world. For this support the ruling classes donate liberally to the church. The organized robbers and organized beggars support each other. . .

"The old is ever shocked by the new. But you of the old can be no more shocked at us than we are at you. You ask what we of labor think of you? We are horrified—horrified at the unnecessary poverty and misery and slavery in the world, horrified at you and your savage God—and we are determined to drive all of you from your thrones. . . And when you have gone the truth will have a chance and peace and love will come and bless the world."—Terrible words!

In order to meet such attacks, not by mere denunciation, but by advocating constructive reforms, the Church must train her ministers much more thoroughly than hitherto, along social lines, and in this work the social commissions are of uncalculable assistance. (See the pamphlet, "Importance of the Study of the Social Sciences to the Modern Minister," by Philip Vollmer)

5. Some religious organizations try to promote good and prevent bad social legislation by direct appeals to our lawmakers at Washington. Hundreds of groups of citizens, such as the American Legion, the wet interests, various farm organizations, etc., are similarly active. Such activity is usually called "lobbying" (from "lobby," that part of a hall not reserved for the legislators), which term refers to efforts by persons not members of a legislature to influence legislation. Such influence may be, and often is, entirely legitimate, honest and unselfish; but in most cases it is dictated by selfish and even by corrupt motives. Hence the evil connotation of the term.

To the very generally voiced demand that the Church keep out

of politics, the "Christian Century" recently gave the following spirited rejoinder:

"That most insolent and bare-faced demand that religion should get off the earth could scarcely go farther than the doctrine, lately announced by the world's wettest newspaper (The Chicago Tribune), that "it is not the privilege of citizens to influence legislative action when it is to promote ideas derived from religious belief, association, organization and teaching through the efforts of such church organizations." According to this interesting theory, any group of citizens may unite to make effective by appropriate legislation any ideas that they may have, either for private gain or for public weal, *unless these ideas have a religious sanction or were derived from a religious source!* Butchers, bakers and candlestick makers, oil producers and steel manufacturers can form their associations, maintain their lobbies at Washington, and bring to bear upon government all the influence that they can command to secure legislation in their several interests, but Christians, as Christians, may not organize to secure legislation which they believe to be for the general welfare. Self-interest may freely utilize the power that comes with concerted action, but those who seek only the common interest must confine themselves to such disjointed and sporadic activities as alone are possible without organization." Away with such tyranny!

Conclusion

The summary of this discussion—der langen Rede kurzer Sinn—may be condensed into the following propositions ("Theses"):

1. Since the politics of a nation can only be cleansed in proportion as the individual citizens live clean, upright and honest lives, the chief business of the Church is to develop true Christ-like characters. This is the Church's peculiar contribution toward political regeneration which no other organization is able to make.

2. But saving souls includes saving the political and social environment in which these souls live and move and have their being. Saving souls in an atmosphere of political and economic corruption is as difficult as permanently curing a tubercular patient without placing him in a climate where he will have the most favorable chance of getting better. It is a widespread belief among Christian people that the moral good will which issues out of the religious experience of the saved individual would apply itself *automatically* to the world's problems. This is a false notion. It does not realize that people may be very moral in one relationship and very immoral in another; that it is therefore necessary to develop a conscience for each moral problem.

3. In all her efforts to cleanse politics the Church should limit herself to her specialty, which is emphasizing principles derived from the Gospel, leaving to statesmen and trained workers

in the several fields to express that gospel in its suitable form. Christians as such are not responsible for preparing or dictating detailed political programs.

4. As even the best type of statesmen and political leaders are constantly exposed to corrupt influences, it is the patriotic duty of the churches to cry aloud and spare not whenever great principles of political righteousness are in special danger. By so doing they will stiffen the moral backbone of good politicians and strike terror to the heart of low-type leaders.

5. It is not partisan intrusion into politics, but mere obedience to Christian duty, to discriminate between aspirants for public office who will do what they promise and such as are the beneficiaries of graft and corruption. Government by grafters is government by criminals. It gets worse by indifference to its smooth viciousness. It is a type of evil with which any compromise is always a temporary expedient.

6. The American Churches must cultivate moral courage in their ministers and members. Tameness is emptying many churches. And when ministers do show courage, tempered with good sense, then the church should protect her major and minor prophets, especially when they are but carrying out decisions made by the church herself.

7. Ministers speaking on political subjects must not discharge their weapons half-cocked; that is, they must have knowledge, as well as good-will. They should beware of "hot air" or ill-digested propaganda. Seminary courses, an immense amount of literature, social commissions, lectures, etc., provide ample intellectual ammunition. These agencies are recognized and encouraged by our church leaders more than ever before, because they read correctly the signs of the approaching social storm in this revolutionary period of the world's history.

8. In exercising their rights the ministers should act with wisdom and tact, as to place, language and spirit. They must do nothing to embitter and disrupt their Churches and endanger their influence with members who may differ from them, and who may be just as sincere as the ministers. As a rule the explosive issues of politics should be kept out of Church services. Literature, forum discussions, etc., are better means of influencing people on political questions.

Brief Selected Biography

McCown. Genesis of the Social Gospel.
Vollmer, Philip. Importance of the Social Sciences for the Modern Minister.
Davis, Jerome. Labor Speaks for Itself.
Niebuhr, Reinhold. Does Civilization Need Religion?
Horstmann, J. H. The Will of God.
McConnell, F. J. Humanism and Christianity.
Vollmer, Philip. New Testament Sociology.

INDIA—SOME OBSERVATIONS OF AN INTERESTED TOURIST*

By Bishop Adna W. Leonard

One fifth of the world's population is to be found in India. In 1872 the population of India was 206,000,000. In 1921 the population was 318,000,000, or an increase of fifty-four percent in fifty years. Whatever may be the criticism of the policy of Great Britain in India, the increase in the population speaks volumes for the improved conditions under British rule.

The most recent government census reveals 2,300 caste divisions, based on differences of blood, occupation, religion, and social tradition, while "The Linguistic Survey of India" has classified 179 languages and 544 dialects. These facts are illuminating and should be kept in mind, especially in any attempt to make known the real situation in India. Whoever he may be—missionary, political agitator, social reformer, teacher, professional or business man—in any effort he may make to change the face of India, he will inevitably find himself enmeshed in problems growing out of the masses of population, the numerous languages and dialects, and the appalling ignorance and superstitions of the people.

At the very outset we desire to have it distinctly understood that our admiration for the British government, as well as our regard for the British people, is very great. One needs only to take a trip around the world and visit the nations of earth to thank God again and again that Britannia still rules the waves, and that her protecting hand is discovered in so many places. This sincere and friendly attitude must not hinder us, however, in an effort to note some observations made possible by a rather extensive trip recently from Bombay to Calcutta. The British government is severely criticized by many enlightened and well-educated Indians for not doing more to improve agricultural methods in order to secure a corresponding rise in the production of food and raw material. In this connection it should be remembered that seventy percent of India's total population are engaged in some form of agricultural pursuits. Notwithstanding this fact, the average yield of wheat per acre in India is only twelve bushels. Compare this with an average of thirty-two bushels per acre in Britain and twenty-six in Egypt.

But here again, the vast population and the ignorance and poverty of the people have much to do with impeding agricultural development. Among the many impeding causes we mention three. The social and religious customs that force marriage and motherhood on India's women. It is regarded as a disgraceful thing for

*Reprinted by permission of the "Christian Advocate."

a daughter of the house to be unmarried at the age of fourteen years. The scale of dowry and wedding festivities is fixed by the unwritten but rigorous laws of custom. It is not an uncommon thing for a villager to borrow a sum of money for his daughter's wedding which represents the net income of the family for many years. That which makes the situation all the worse is that at such times the money is usually borrowed from professional money leaders, who charge not less than thirty percent interest, and often exact a still higher rate. This, of course, works a great hardship on the entire family, and frequently for a long period of years.

One of our Christian families in India contracted a marriage loan before they became Christians. The loan was ten rupees, and it took the entire family ten years to free themselves of the debt. They reported at a recent conference that their joy was full because the Lord had helped them make the final payment on the loan, which at the end of the ten-year period was 250 rupees. The natural result of the general practice of child marriage is enfeebled mothers, frail and sickly infants, and a perfectly appalling child mortality.

Another impeding cause is the unspeakable poverty and moral conditions of the sixty million outcasts, who are denied the commonest human rights, and whose caste dooms them to a heartless degradation.

There is still a third impeding cause, and that is an adamantine wall of caste which prevents the introduction of modern agriculture. This is the caste that restrains the handling of animal and bone manure except by the outcasts.

It is quite generally agreed by those who have seriously studied this question that there are three ways by which the agricultural conditions in India can be improved. The first is the creation of alternative industries; second, the exclusion of foreign cotton, which is Mr. Gandhi's demand; and third an immense increase of agricultural productivity through improved methods. This would also involve the bringing into use of the forty percent of cultivable land which the government estimates to be still unused. The poverty of the people would be the greatest obstacle in the way of carrying out the third suggestion.

Religion, illiteracy, and *poverty* are the trinity of powerful influences in India which must be taken into consideration at every turn.

The sacred water tanks in the villages furnish the main water supply, which to us would be utterly intolerable. They serve as reservoirs, and are filled often to overflowing during the rains of the monsoon from June to September. They are rectangular in

shape, and a gradual decline on one side, sometimes steps, makes the approach to the tank comparatively easy. For a limited number of hours each day the women may use the tank exclusively. Sacred bulls and the village buffalo wallow along the edge, stirring up the mud and filth; women beat the clothes on stones in a vain endeavor to get them clean, and then rub and rinse them in the foul, green water; the brass and copper bowls are rubbed and scoured with the mud and sand on the shore, and then washed in the thick water of the stagnant pool. It is needless to say that all these village pools or tanks breed mosquitoes throughout the twenty-four hours of the day. Toward the close of the dry season the conditions which obtain in or near these tanks are so unsanitary, one wonders that it is possible for human beings to live in such close proximity to them.

Indians a Religious People

If there is any country in the world where religion is given first consideration, it is India. Here people have time for religion. The Hindu religion, introduced by the Aryan invaders, is not so much a faith as a system of manners and conduct, but it holds within its grasp and gives direction to the life of 220,000,000 of human beings.

Of all the great religions, Buddhism alone had its origin in India. The place where Buddha started upon his very remarkable career is not far from the city of Benares, and is today visited chiefly by tourists. Hinduism has absorbed and crowded out Buddhism in India so completely that there is scarcely a vestige of it left. Mohammedanism in India claims 70,000,000 of followers, and constitutes by far the largest body of Mohammedan believers to be found in any country of the world.

The Christian religion, though numbering but five millions, is becoming increasingly influential, and is making a profound impression on all phases of Indian life.

The dominating religions of India are so vast in their proportions and so intricate in their organizations, that any attempt to define or to explain them would require more space than could possibly be given to them in this connection. India today is the battleground of religious conservatism on the one hand, and the forces that make for modern progress on the other.

Hinduism is a method of absorption and a system of inclusions. An eminent scholar, who has spent many years in India, has said: "A man today may be a monotheist, a polytheist, a pantheist, or an atheist, and still be an orthodox Hindu. Hinduism is more a medley than a blend. There is in it so much of good, and so much also of evil. Here lies the weakness. It waits for a fan that

will separate the wheat from the chaff." Pessimism is a canker eating at the heart of Hinduism, for the latter declares and insists that existence is so bad that the only thing to do is to get rid of it. Here is to be discovered the secret of India's exaltation of the spiritual, and until this is understood, it is not possible to comprehend India, especially from the standpoint of Hinduism. Out of this conception of the material universe grows the Hindu doctrine of Karma and rebirth. "Release comes when you have recognized the unreality of the material universe. Only spirit (Brahma) really exists."

The Idolatry of Hinduism

There is nothing more repulsive than the idolatry of Hinduism. Whatever defense may be made of it on the ground of helpful imagery of symbolism, it can have nothing but the most degrading effect upon those who worship at the shrines. The very shapes and forms of the gods are hideous, and many of the teachings regarding them are suggestive of the basest and vilest human passions. Govinda Das, a Hindu reformer, in writing on the orgies of a large sect in Bengal, says: "Nothing but nervous breakdowns and bestiality of character can result from such foul depravity masquerading as religion."

The sad fact is, you must visit the temples in order to see not the best, but the worst side of Hinduism. It is in the temples that sensuality reaches its deepest depths. There one sees temple prostitutes dedicated in their infancy to a life of shame. All this, and more, in the name of religion.

It is frequently said, and I have heard it more than once on this trip, that the very sins which abound in India are to be found in Christian England and America. In answer to this indictment it may be said that where these sins are practiced in Christian countries, they exist in spite of and in opposition to the religion of the country, and in violation of the laws of the land.

The British in India

The story of the British government in India is a long and interesting one. More than once on this cruise around the world I have been reminded of the service Great Britain is rendering to the world through her dominion and colonial policies. As a result of this world cruise my admiration for the British government has increased. It would be a tragedy unspeakable if there should ever arise any serious misunderstanding between the United States of America and Great Britain. It is impossible to enumerate the gains that have accrued to India as the direct result of British occupation. Mention can be made of only a few of these benefits.

Law and order have been established; internal peace has been secured; judicial procedure is now required in the settlement of disputes between sect and sect and the rich and the poor; through a common language and the centralizing of government administration the uniting of India as one people and nation is being accomplished; the building of railroads, the organization of postal and telegraph systems; the redeeming of millions of acres of agricultural land by building forty thousand miles of irrigation canals; and the encouragement given to modern education are some of the benefits regarded as fundamentally essential in the civilization which Great Britain has made possible to India.

In calling attention to the other side, the writer fully realizes the delicacy of such an attempt, and how easily one exposes himself to the charge of prejudice or ignorance, or both.

England is committed to the policy of gradual realization of self-government for India. The problem is unquestionably a very difficult one, and the brief experience of the United States of America in the Philippines is but an illustration of the larger task which England has assumed in India. The charge that is made against the British government, and one which we often heard, was that the government, is constantly putting obstacles in the way of progressive legislation for the good of India. Many Indians have lost confidence in England because of what they believe are unfulfilled promises which England made to India during the uncertain days of the great war.

Child labor under seven years of age was not abolished until 1881. Not until 1891 were the working hours for women limited to eleven per day, and as late as 1922 legislation was passed establishing for women's labor the hours of daylight and one rest day per week.

We also heard it said repeatedly that the English official members combined with the ultra-orthodox Hindu wing that killed the bill in March, 1925, raising the "age of consent" from twelve to fourteen years. We are glad to record that since then a bill was passed, supported by the English officials, raising the "age of consent" to thirteen years in marriage, and fourteen outside of marriage.

Richest Colonial Possession

It is frequently stated that England is "scuttling" India to her own financial advantage, inasmuch as India is her richest colonial possession.

The statement by Sir W. Joynson-Hicks, Home Secretary, as quoted in "The India Social Reformer" for November 28, 1925, sticks in the minds of educated and patriotic Indians. He said:

"We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. I know it is said at missionary meetings that we conquered India to raise the level of the Indians. That is cant. We conquered India as the outlet for the goods of Great Britain. We conquered India by the sword, and by the sword we should hold it."

While it may be said that such an utterance does not represent the best English mind today, nevertheless such an expression by a British cabinet minister is very significant, and the people of India will not forget. We can but mention the Amritsar tragedy concerning which it has been said, "If India be indeed a lost dominion, it was lost at Amritsar," and the fact that a resolution was passed by a large majority in the session of the legislative assembly at Delhi in the face of a very stubborn official opposition, "asking government to accept as its ultimate policy total prohibition of the manufacture, import, and sale of alcholic liquors, except for medicinal and scientific purposes," does not tend to make the educated Indian more loyal to Great Britain.

England is also responsible for the increasing opium evil in India.

The production, distribution, and sale of opium are under the direct control of the British government, and it goes without saying that the revenue derived from the consumption of the drug is very great. There are more than six thousand retail opium shops in British India. One writer states that twenty-three hundred men and women were counted entering one of Calcutta's opium shops in one day. One anna (two cents) buys six and three-quarter grains of opium. It is a common practice for mothers to drug their babies before going to work, and it is a notorious fact that little babies carried in the arms of beggars on the streets remain quiet and seldom cry because they have been drugged with opium.

These are a few of the more serious charges that are brought against England by educated and patriotic Indians, and from the standpoint of an outsider they would seem to be very serious.

If in these days of a rising assertiveness on the part of the Indian people, England should continue to lose her moral prestige in India, it is not impossible to conceive of a day approaching, and possibly sooner than some dream, when India will be in fact "a lost dominion."

The Breaking Day

The Christian movement in India is making greater gains than ever before. A survey of all the Christian bodies reveals the interesting fact that Christianity has gained within the past decade approximately twenty-two percent. This is a greater gain in percentage than that of any of the other faiths of India.

Although it is difficult to discover any enthusiasm over European Christianity, there is a positive enthusiasm over the life and teachings of Jesus.

A very prominent member of the Provincial Council, residing in Calcutta, said to me, "Forty years ago India was anti-Christ—today India is pro-Christ." Of course, this gentleman did not mean to convey the idea that there is in India today a general turning of the people to Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. He did refer, however, to the irresistible appeal Jesus is making to the educated as well as to the uneducated people. The matchless character of Jesus is a new challenge to awaking India, and in such an hour the Christian church at home must not falter. It is no time for a message of compromise. Caste is showing signs of crumbling, and as never before, Jesus, the Divine Son of God and Saviour of men, must be presented to India's teeming millions. Tagore, India's great educational leader and modern Shakespeare, permits no idolatry to be practiced within the grounds or buildings of his university. Christian teachers are numbered among the faculties of Tagore's remarkable school of learning. The poet is friendly to Christianity, although he is emphatic in stating that he is not a Christian.

Gandhi has been definitely influenced by Christianity. He once said, "There was a time when I was wavering between Hinduism and Christianity." His favorite hymn is "Lead, Kindly Light." He has made it easier for Christianity in India. He is without doubt the idol of the people.

But let it be borne in mind that Gandhi is a Hindu, although in some respects an unorthodox Hindu. He prefers the Bhagavad Gita to the New Testament. He calls himself a Sanatan Hindu because he believes in the Vedas and Hindu Scriptures, avatara (incarnation), and rebirth. He believes in and advocates caste, although he is opposed to the caste of the untouchables. He believes in the protection of the cow, and like Tagore, is strictly opposed to idol worship. In the face of all this, how can he be called a Christian? It is one thing for a person to admire the life and character of Jesus, and quite another to fall at His feet and cry out, "My Lord and my God!"

It is most unfortunate that statements have been made on certain platforms in America conveying the idea that Gandhi is a Christian. We all wish he were, but the fact remains he is not a Christian.—*Christian Advocate.*

Christentum und Metaphysik

Von Professor Dr. Grützmacher.

I.

In der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christentum und Erkenntnistheorie wurde gezeigt, wie der gläubige Mensch unmittelbar gewiß ist, eine objektive diesseitige und jenseitige Welt zu erreichen. Die philosophische Erkenntnistheorie des kritischen Realismus will zunächst aber nicht mehr als eine objektive diesseitige Welt erreichen. Denn für die Philosophie ist es in der neueren Zeit mehr und mehr zum Problem geworden, **ob die menschliche Erkenntnis über die unmittelbare Erfahrung herausgehen und zuletzt eine Ueberwelt erfassen kann. Das aber ist das Problem der Metaphysik.** Der Ausdruck, der sich zunächst Anschluß an die äußere Anordnung der aristotelischen Schriften bildete, betrifft im übertragenem Sinn die Gedanken, welche über die nächstliegende Erfahrung hinausgehen und die letzten Rätsel aller Dinge durch die Annahme einer Ueberwelt beantworten wollen. In der Antike und dem Mittelalter glaubte man wesentlich auf dem Weg reinen Denkens metaphysische Ideen gewinnen zu können. Rational zwingende Schlüsse sollten vor allem zum Beweis der Existenz Gottes und der Unsterblichkeit führen. Aber die schon früher geübte Kritik an dem erkenntnistheoretischen Rationalismus trifft in noch erhöhtem Maß auf seine metaphysischen Konstruktionen zu. Nichts garantiert, daß rein logischen Gebilden auch eine Wirklichkeit entspricht, sei es im Diesseits und noch weniger im Jenseits. Darum war es richtig, wenn Kant der rein rationalen spekulativen Metaphysik eine scharfe Kritik zuwandte und nachwies, daß alle ihre Hauptsätze wie etwa die Unendlichkeit oder die Endlichkeit der Welt sich mit gleichguten Argumenten beweisen beziehungsweise nicht beweisen ließen. **Kant machte aller rein rationalen Metaphysik ein Ende.** Er glaubte aber dafür die auf theoretischem Weg nicht erfaßbaren letzten Wahrheiten auf praktisch sittlichem als sogenannte Postulate wiedergewinnen zu können. Unser sittliches Handeln verlangt die Anerkennung einer Willensfreiheit, einer Gottheit, einer Unsterblichkeit. Wir müssen damit rechnen, auch wenn sie sich mit dem Verstand in keiner Weise rechtfertigen lassen.

Mit dieser Stellungnahme aber führte Kant einen Dualismus in das geistige Leben des Menschen ein, der konsequent durchgedacht nach der einen oder andern Seite weiterdrängt und das auch in der folgenden philosophischen Entwicklung getan hat. Der eine Kreis von Kants Schülern verstand seine praktischen Postulate nur als Annahmen, die um ihres Nutzens willen in der Welt Geltung haben sollten, auch wenn sie metaphysisch nicht existierten, sondern geradezu unwahr wären. In Deutschland hat diese Auffassung der

Neukantische Positivismus in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts vertreten und in besonders zugespitzter Form im 20. Jahrhundert der noch heute lebende Hallenser Philosoph Vaihinger. In Frankreich hat sich diesen Gedankengängen Bergson genähert, in Amerika und England ist der Pragmatismus — von Männern wie Schiller und James vertreten — zu einer breiteren Strömung geworden. **Gemeinsam ist diesen Richtungen der Gedanke, daß alle theoretischen und erst recht metaphysischen Annahmen nicht auf ihren Wahrheitsgehalt, sondern auf ihre Nützlichkeit im weitesten Sinn des Wortes zu prüfen sind.** Bewährt sich ein Gedanke als förderlich für das Handeln, so ist er anzuerkennen, auch wenn ihm keinerlei reale Wahrheit entspricht. Auch religiöse Ideen sind dieser Beurteilung unterworfen. Gibt der Glaube an Gott und die Unsterblichkeit den Menschen Friede und sittliche Kraft, so sind sie beizuhalten, auch wenn ihnen keinerlei jenseitige Realität entspricht.

Allein diese Annahme von der Wirkung solcher — in Kürze als „Fiktionen" bezeichneter — Ideen läßt sich doch nur so lange aufrecht erhalten, als ein Mensch ihre objektive Unsicherheit oder Unwahrheit nicht durchschaut hat. Schon auf Kinder wirken moralische Märchen nur so lange, als sie deren Märchencharakter nicht erkannt haben. Ist das aber der Fall, so verlieren sie jede Wirkung. Erst recht hört jeder Erwachsene auf sich durch einen Gedanken von einem Jenseits beeinflussen zu lassen, von dem er nicht weiß, ob es existiert und nicht ein reines Gebilde seiner Phantasie ist. **Gerade dem religiösen Menschen ist es unmittelbar sicher, daß sein Glaube nur so lange für ihn einen inneren Wert hat, als er auch von seiner Wahrheit überzeugt ist.** Die Frage nach der historischen Existenz Jesu ist mit recht stets von gläubigen Christen auch darum bejaht worden, weil ein legendärer Erlöser jede praktische Wirkung verliert.

Infolgedessen kann der Kantische Dualismus nicht in dem Sinn aufrecht erhalten werden, daß man in einem Gegensatz zwischen Wert und Wahrheit, Postulaten des Handelns und Erkenntnissen des Verstandes beharrt. Vielmehr müssen beide Reihen harmonisch sich miteinander einigen und gerade die praktisch erfolgreichen Werte als besondre Stützen der Wahrheit verstanden werden. Weil der Mensch ohne Willensfreiheit nicht leben und handeln kann, muß sie tatsächlich bestehen, wenn auch zu ihrer Sicherung eine besondre freie jenseitige Welt angenommen werden muß.

Aus der Gesamtheit seiner Erfahrung, sowohl der sinnlichen Wahrnehmung und ihrer denkenden Verarbeitung, wie auch seinem sittlichen Handeln und seinem Fühlen empfängt der Mensch die Antriebe und die Möglichkeiten zu metaphysischen Erkenntnissen. Diesen Weg ist in der modernen Philosophie die sogenannte in-

duktive Metaphysik gegangen, die zahlreiche Vertreter in allen Ländern gewonnen hat. Sie konstruiert die letzten Wahrheiten nicht mehr in kühner spekulativer Konstruktion von oben her, sondern steigt vorsichtig von unten Schritt für Schritt aus der Ebene auf die Berge an den Stellen, wo jene selbst den Weg dazu weist. Schon die exakten Einzelwissenschaften zwingen immer wieder an verschiedenen Punkten über die unmittelbaren sinnlichen Erfahrungen und Beobachtungen und deren gedankliche Wiedergabe hinauszugehen. Ein Atom im strengen Sinne hat nie eines Naturforschers Auge, selbst nicht durch das schärfste Mikroskop gesehen. Und doch muß die Naturwissenschaft zur Erklärung einer Reihe tatsächlicher Beobachtungen zur Annahme von Atomen fortschreiten. Nicht minder wird nur häufiger die regelmäßige Wiederkehr einzelner Erscheinungen beobachtet, während die Annahme ihrer in allen Fällen sich durchsetzenden Gleichartigkeit oder kürzer die Behauptung eines Gesetzes schon eine metaphysische Annahme ist. Auch der Psychologe sieht nur einzelne seelische Vorgänge, die ihm aber unverständlich bleiben, wenn er nicht zu der Annahme einer in jenen wirksamen Seele fortschreitet. Exakt lassen sich auch in der Geschichte nur einzelne Vorgänge feststellen, aber es gibt keinen Historiker, der sie nicht in einen größeren historischen Zusammenhang, sei es der Kultur eines einzelnen Volkes, sei es der gesamten Menschheit einstellt. **So erwachsen aus allen Einzelwissenschaften metaphysische Annahmen.**

Diese stehen zunächst unvermittelt nebeneinander, ja nicht selten in scheinbarem Gegensatz, wie die materialistischen Behauptungen naturwissenschaftlicher und idealistischen geschichtswissenschaftlicher Metaphysik. Dem menschlichen Geist wohnt jedoch der Trieb zur Einheit und Widerspruchslosigkeit ein. Er will die Ergebnisse der verschiedenen Wissenschaften miteinander ausgleichen. Diese Aufgabe übernimmt die eigentlich **philosophische Metaphysik.** Ihre Lösung wird nur möglich durch einen weiteren Aufstieg in jenseits aller Erfahrung liegende Ideen wie etwa die eines hinter Natur, Geschichte, Seele stehenden Weltprinzips, das sich in jenen Erscheinungen nur in verschiedener Weise manifestiert. Eine monistische Weltanschauung mit deutlich metaphysischem Charakter entsteht. Zu ihr tragen freilich nicht nur die rein itellektuellen Erwägungen der Philosophie bei, sondern auch praktische Erlebnisse und Gemütsempfindungen. Man will das eine und macht es darum zum Weltprinzip. Man erlebt überall die gleichen Stimmungen und läßt sie darum von einer einzigen Ursache hervorgerufen sein. Umgekehrt werden Menschen, die in ihrem Handeln stark die Gegensätze zwischen Gut und Böse spüren auch einen Dualismus in die letzten Weltprinzipien eintragen, siehe die Zarathustra-Religion!

Alle diese Antriebe aus theoretischer und praktischer Erfahrung sucht die Philosophie in einer metaphysischen Weltanschauung zusammenzufassen. Je höher sie freilich emporsteigt, desto blasser werden ihre Erkenntnisse und desto unsicherer ihre Ergebnisse. Nicht ganz mit Unrecht hat man die philosophische Metaphysik eine Begriffsdichtung genannt und ihr den Charakter strenger Wissenschaft abgesprochen. Der paradoxe Tatbestand ist der, daß menschliches Denken nicht auf letzte metaphysische Abschlüsse verzichten kann und doch nicht fähig ist, sie wirklich allgemeingültig und klar zu erreichen. Der Weg von unten nach oben, zu dessen Beschreitung ein unwiderstehlicher Zwang immer wieder den menschlichen Geist veranlaßt, führt in Nebel hinein, aus denen nur dann und wann einige Bergesgipfel und ein Stück Himmel in wechselnder Beleuchtung hervorscheinen.

In diese Schwierigkeit und Unvollendetheit der philosophischen Metaphysik greift die **religiöse Erkenntnis** lösend und vollendend ein. Denn kein Erfahrungsgebiet liefert so viel Antriebe und Beiträge zum Aufstieg in die Metaphysik wie das religiöse. Erst im religiösen Erleben werden die innersten Bedürfnisse der menschlichen Seele nach der Begegnung mit dem Unendlichen und Ewigen lebendig. Erst die religiöse Naturbetrachtung treibt zum Verständnis ihrer letzten Herkunft in einem göttlichen Schöpferwillen und ihres höchsten Zieles als Unterbau eines göttlichen Reiches. Die religiöse Geschichtsbetrachtung findet in der ganzen menschlichen Geschichte den Zusammenhang und die Einsenkung einer Erlösung und Heilsgeschichte. Vor allem aber bedeutet jeder echte religiöse Vorgang einen direkten Schritt in die volle Transzendenz. Das Gemüt fühlt sich abhängig vom Absoluten, der Wille empfängt seine Ziele durch einen ewigen Willen, es entsteht eine Verkehrsgemeinschaft mit Gott. **Auf Grund dieser praktisch religiösen Erfahrungen einer metaphysischen Wirklichkeit entwirft jede Religion und vor allem das Christentum eine metaphysische Weltanschauung, in der sie alle Tatbestände von Gott aus deutet.** Diese Gedankenwelt sieht sie aber in den Grundzügen nicht als eine selbsterdachte an, sondern als eine von Gott empfangene, weil offenbarte. **Die letzte Quelle der religiösen Metaphysik ist die Offenbarung** das heißt eine besondre Selbstbezeugung Gottes in der Welt. Für die Religion lichten sich darum die Nebel, und selbst die Berge erscheinen nur als irdische höchste Spitzen, über denen Gott sichtbar wird. Religion birgt metaphysische Weltanschauung in weitestem Ausmaß und in sicherster Fundamentierung in sich.

Erst sie vermag der philosophischen Metaphysik die notwendige Hilfe in ihren Schwierigkeiten und wirkliche Abschlüsse in Weltanschauungsfragen zu ermöglichen. Es gibt darum keine umfassende

philosophische Weltanschauung, die nicht offen oder heimlich eine Anlehnung bei der Religion macht. Platos letzte Ideen tragen fraglos religiösen Charakter und zu ihrer Veranschaulichung benutzt er darum religiöse Mythen, die nachweislich aus dem Orphismus stammen. Alle nachchristlichen metaphysischen Weltanschauungen verraten deutlich ihre positive oder mindestens negative Abhängigkeit von der christlichen Metaphysik. Umgekehrt aber bedarf auch eine religiös fundamentierte Weltanschauung der Verbindung mit den Ergebnissen einzelwissenschaftlicher und philosophischer Metaphysik. Denn weder die religiöse Erfahrung noch die geschichtliche Offenbarung geben Antriebe oder Möglichkeiten, das Wesen eines Atoms oder eines naturwissenschaftlichen Gesetzes, eines kulturgeschichtlichen Zusammenhanges oder selbst das Verhältnis seelischer Einzelbewegungen zum Ich zu erkennen. Alle diese Fragen lösen die Einzelwissenschaften und die Philosophie, um von der religiösen Metaphysik in ihr System aufgenommen zu werden. **So findet eine gegenseitige Annäherungsbewegung zwischen religiöser und allgemeiner Metaphysik statt.** Die religiöse Metaphysik übernimmt die Einzelresultate der allgemeinen, wie umgekehrt die philosophische Metaphysik für ihren letzten Abschluß der religiösen bedarf. **Theologie und Philosophie lassen sich** — was immer man auch in dieser Richtung versucht hat — **nicht reinlich voneinander scheiden.** Sobald die Theologie von Gott spricht, nennt sie damit auch das letzte Prinzip des Weltverständnisses und sobald die Philosophie von einem Absoluten reden will, macht sie eine Anleihe bei der Religion.

II.

Besteht bei dieser Sachlage ein wirklicher Zusammenhang zwischen Religion und Metaphysik, Theologie und Philosophie, so sind beide Gebiete immer wieder zu einer Auseinandersetzung und dem Versuch einer Harmonisierung genötigt. Denn Glauben und Wissen gehören zusammen und im geistigen Haushalt ist nur dann volle Befriedigung, wenn der Glaube auch die letzten Fragen des Wissens löst, wie umgekehrt das Wissen im Glauben endet. Was so für den Einzelnen persönlich gilt, trifft auch auf die Geschichte der theologischen und philosophischen Metaphysik und ihrer Systeme zu. Zwischen ihnen ist stets eine Auseinandersetzung erfolgt und auch das Ziel einer harmonischen Verbindung immer wieder aufgestellt. **Die theologische Apologetik hat die Aufgabe eine solche Diskussion mit allen noch heute vertretenen philosophischen Weltanschauungen zu vollziehen.** Ihre Zahl ist keine allzugroße und positiv lohnend ist nur die Berücksichtigung solcher philosophischer Richtungen, die auch ihrerseits auf eine Verbindung mit den Christentum ausgegangen sind. Das haben in neuerer Zeit vor allen

Dingen Hegel und Schelling getan, indem sie religiös-christliche Erkenntnisse mit in ihre Gedankenwelt hineinnahmen. Die Auseinandersetzung mit ihnen bietet darum das beste konkrete Beispiel für die prinzipielle Verhältnisbestimmung von philosophischer und religiöser Metaphysik.

Für **Hegel** steht am Anfang aller Dinge der Geist, der aber erst durch einen entwicklungsgeschichtlichen Prozeß hindurchgehen muß, um zu seiner Vollendung zu gelangen. Die absolute Vernunft wandelt sich notwendig in ihr Gegenteil, die Natur, um. Aus der Natur erhebt sich von Neuem und in gesteigerter Form der Geist. Aber auch dieser Geist muß sich weiter entwickeln und in drei Stadien emporsteigen, zum subjektiven Geist in der Form seelischen Lebens, zum objektiven Geist, wie er in den großen Schöpfungen des Rechtes, der Moralität und Sittlichkeit, besonders in der Gestalt des Staates, lebt und dann zur Sphäre des absoluten Geistes. Erst in dieser kommt der Geist zum vollen Selbstbewußtsein, das heißt zur Erkenntnis des Zusammenfallens von Endlichem und Unendlichem und zwar in der Kunst in der Form der Anschauung, in der Religion in der Form der symbolischen Vorstellung, in der Philosophie in der Form des reinen Begriffes. Durch diese Einstellung der Religion in den geistesgeschichtlichen Prozeß und zwar als die vorletzte Stufe vor der Vollendung hat Hegel ihr eine sehr große Bedeutung für die Erkenntnis der höchsten metaphysischen Wirklichkeit beigelegt. Definiert er doch geradezu „Religion als Selbstbewußtsein des absoluten Geistes." Die Religion erschließt das innerste Wesen des Geistes, indem sie das Unendliche und Endliche, das Göttliche mit dem Menschlichen verbindet. Keine Religion tut das in gleichem Maß wie das Christentum, das von Hegel nicht nur an die Spitze der bisherigen religionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung gestellt, sondern auch als die absolute und unüberbietbare Religion angesehen wird. Der Mittelpunkt des Christentums ist Christus der Gottmensch. „Es muß dem Menschen die an sich seiende Einheit der göttlichen und menschlichen Natur in gegenständlicher Weise offenbar werden. Dies ist durch die Menschwerdung Gottes in Christus geschehen." Auch alle andern zentralen christlichen Ideen, wie die von der Dreieinigkeit und der Versöhnung nimmt Hegel in sein System auf und gibt ihnen höchste metaphysische Bedeutung.

Infolgedessen konnte Hegel und erst recht eine Anzahl seiner theologischen Schüler bis in die Gegenwart glauben, daß in seiner Philosophie die christliche Religion zu einer reinen Ausprägung ihres geistigen Gehaltes gekommen sei. Und wirklich sind eine Reihe grundlegender Tendenzen der christlichen Weltanschauung, wie die enge Verbindung Gottes mit Natur und Geschichte, die

steigende Erschließung des göttlichen Wesens in der Weltentwicklung, die Feststellung des Gegensatzes, aber auch der Verbundenheit von Endlichem und Unendlichem, seine höchste persönliche Offenbarung in Christus — von Hegel aus der christlichen Religion als wichtige Beiträge zur Gestaltung seiner philosophischen Metaphysik übernommen. Aber auf der andern Seite hat doch auch Hegel prinzipiell wichtige Bestandteile der christlichen Weltanschauung nicht aufgenommen oder doch so umgebogen, daß sie vom Standpunkt des Christentums nicht mehr als zutreffend anerkannt werden können. Aus christlichem Theismus wird bei Hegel Pantheismus, wenn er die Formel bildet: „Ohne die Welt ist Gott nicht Gott," das heißt aber, daß er die Unabhängigkeit und Selbständigkeit Gottes gegenüber der Welt preisgibt. Ebenso hat Hegel einen Monismus zwischen Gut und Böse in dem Maß vertreten, daß das Böse als das beste positive Föderungsmittel des Menschentums erscheint: „Durch den Sündenfall wird der Mensch erst Mensch" — eine Vorstellung, die sich nicht mit der absoluten christlichen Scheidung zwischen Gott und Sünde verträgt. Auch die Verbindung der metaphysischen Idee der Einheit des Göttlichen und Menschlichen wird bei Hegel nur sehr lose mit der geschichtlichen Person Jesu vollzogen. Christus ist nicht viel mehr als ein anschauliches Symbol für jene auch ohne ihn bestehende und gültige Idee. Gerade hier wird deutlich, daß für Hegel alle seelischen Tatbestände und historischen Inhalte der christlichen Religion doch nur phantasievolle Einkleidungen für rein philosophische Ideen sind. Die Einreihung der Religion in die vorletzte Stufe der Entwicklung bedeutet darum nicht nur eine Hochschätzung für sie, sondern ebensogut eine Zurücksetzung, da sie in der letzten Stufe, der philosophischen aufgehoben wird. — **Hegels System bildet mithin das Beispiel einer sehr weitgehenden positiven Heranziehung von Religion und Christentum bei dem Entwurf einer metaphysischen Weltanschauung. Aber es zeigt auch die damit gegebenen Gefahren, daß die Philosophie die religiösen Tatbestände verflüssigt und ihre Vorstellungen umdeutet.** Bei Hegel ist die Religion nicht Ausgangs- und auch nicht Zielpunkt, sondern nur ein — wenn auch sehr bedeutender — Durchgangspunkt für die Metaphysik.

Auch **Schelling** hat in den früheren Perioden seines philosophischen Schaffens Hegel sehr ähnliche Gedankengänge vertreten, aber er hat zuletzt eine besondre **„Philosophie der Offenbarung"** vertreten. Diese nimmt bei der religiösen Offenbarung ihren Ausgangspunkt und will die in ihr positiv enthaltenen Prinzipien zu einer metaphysischen Weltanschauung entwickeln. Die Offenbarung ist ihm eine besondre eigenartige Erkenntnisquelle, deren Inhalt darum nicht aus reiner Vernunft „apriori" zu konstruieren, son-

dern nur nachträglich zu verstehen ist. Der Inhalt der Offenbarung ist eine höhere Geschichte, die bis zum Anfang der Dinge zurück und bis zu deren Ende hinausreicht. Die Philosophie der Offenbarung will nichts anders, als diese höhere Geschichte erklären und auf ihre metaphysischen Prinzipien zurückführen. Hinter der irdischen Wirklichkeit steht die Gottheit; diese macht in sich selbst einen Werdeprozeß durch — nicht erst in der Welt wie bei Hegel. Die Dreieinigkeit ist Ausdruck dieses innergöttlichen Werdens. Aber Schelling bemüht sich auch in Gott selbst den Möglichkeitsgrund des Bösen nachzuweisen und nähert sich der Gefahr eines Monismus zwischen Gut und Böse, Gott und Satan. Auf der andern Seite sucht er immer wieder den christlichen Dualismus zu wahren und doch dem brennendem Bedürfnis des menschlichen Verstandes nach Erklärung des Bösen gerecht zu werden. Gott und Satan werden in der Anschauungswelt der Bibel und den Erlebnissen des religiösen Menschen entsprechende paradoxe Formeln gefaßt. „Wenngleich in einem großen Teil des Neuen Testaments Satan als vorzüglicher Urheber des Bösen und insofern als Feind Gottes beschrieben wird, so erscheint er doch anderseits als ein zur göttlichen Oekonomie selbst gehöriges und insofern von Gott selbst anerkanntes Prinzip." Die Offenbarunggeschichte wird von Schelling in ihren tatsächlichen natürlichen und wunderbaren Ereignissen vollkommen anerkannt, aber aus ihr zugleich bestimmte metaphysische Erkenntnisse abgelesen. So heißt es zum Beispiel: „Tatsachen wie die Auferstehung Christi sind wie Blitze, in welchen die höhere, das heißt die wahre innere Geschichte in die bloß äußere hindurchleuchtend hineintritt. Die äußere Geschichte nicht aufzulösen in jene höhere, aber in ihrem Zusammenhang mit dieser zu erhalten — dies ist die Philosophie der Offenbarung."

Von der Schellingschen Philosophie der Offenbarung darf man sagen, daß sie methodisch wie inhaltlich von allen philosophischen Weltanschauungen am meisten der christlichen Metaphysik gerecht wird, weil sie vor allem aus der positiven geschichtlichen Offenbarung schöpft. An sie hat sich darum mit Recht die Erlanger Schule und auch J. A. Dorner angeschlossen. Und auch die Zukunftsarbeit kann unter Abscheidung alles Veralteten und Unverständlichen an Schelling anknüpfen. Denn im Unterschied zu der Ritschlschen radikalen Abwehr aller Metaphysik und der in der dialektischen Theologie der Gegenwart betonten Gegensätzlichkeit zwischen christlicher und philosophischer Metaphysik, wird die Meinung bestehen bleiben, daß gerade auch die Philosophie ein Weg zu Gott sein kann, sie das aber nur wirklich werden wird, wenn sie die Religion und das Christentum entscheidend mitberücksichtigt.

Warum haben die Lutheraner eine größere Zunahme zu verzeichnen als alle andern Kirchen?

Pastor G. Fr. Schuetze, S. T. M.

Als ich das mir gestellte Thema: Warum haben die Lutheraner eine größere Zunahme an Gliedern zu verzeichnen als alle andern Kirchen? las, kamen mir Zweifel, ob sich das auch so verhalte? Ich besorgte mir darum lutherische Statistiken, die in der Tat ein erstaunliches Wachstum der lutherischen Kirche ergeben. Das bezieht sich nun natürlich nicht auf verschiedene einzelne lutherische Teilsynoden, sondern auf die lutherische Kirche als ganzes, wobei — wenigstens in englischen Statistiken, die den Unterschied zwischen unsrer und der lutherischen Kirche einmal nicht begreifen zu können scheinen — auch unsre Synode teilweise eingeschlossen sein mag. Ob dieses Wachstum nun wirklich das Wachstum **aller** andern Kirchen übersteigt, dafür allerdings muß ich die Verantwortung der Schriftleitung des „Magazins" überlassen.

Sehen wir nun die Statistik der lutherischen Kirche an, so finden wir, daß im Jahre 1619 in den Vereinigten Staaten nur eine lutherische Gemeinde mit 65 konfirmierten, also kommunionsberechtigten Gliedern bestand; im Jahre 1919 dagegen 14,322 Gemeinden mit 2,459,578 Kommunikanten (cf. The Lutheran World Almanac for 1921, p. 564 f.). Wenn wir uns diese Zahlen überlegen, so ergeben sie ein Wachstum von durchschnittlich 47.74 Gemeinden und 8198.38 Gliedern pro Jahr. Oder nehmen wir die Statistik der gesamten lutherischen Kirchenglieder in der ganzen Welt, so finden wir, daß im Jahre 1836 die Gesamtzahl aller Lutheraner 27,000,000 betrug (cf. Rupp, I. Dan.: Religious Denominations, 1844), im Jahre 1917, dem Jubiläumsjahr der Reformation, dagegen 81,526,225 (cf. Lenker, J. N.: Lutherans in All Lands, 1917). Das bedeutet eine Zunahme von über dreihundert Prozent. In den letzten Jahren ist dieses Wachstum womöglich noch deutlicher zu spüren. The Lutheran World Almanac für 1926 gibt 15,901 Gemeinden in den U. S. A. mit 2,622,554 konfirmierten Gliedern und 91 im Jahr vorher gegründeten neuen Gemeinden. Das bedeutet eine Zunahme von 1579 Gemeinden in den letzten sieben Jahren oder eine jährliche Durchschnittszunahme von über zweihundert Gemeinden. Mit andern Worten: Mindestens jeden zweiten Tag wurde eine neue lutherische Gemeinde ins Leben gerufen. Die Zunahme der Gliederzahl beläuft sich auf 23,282 im Jahr. Noch auffallender wurde das Wachstum in den letzten zwei Jahren. Der Lutheran Almanac 1928, der letzte erschienene, gibt als die amtliche Zahl aller lutherischen Gemeinden in den U. S. A. 16,896. Das bedeutet, daß in diesen beiden Jahren kein Tag vergangen ist, an dem nicht wenigstens eine neue lutherische Ge-

meinde organisiert wurde. Die Gliederzahl ist in diesen beiden Jahren von 2,622,554 auf 2,707,183 konfirmierte Glieder gestiegen, also über 42,000 im Jahr. Das läßt sich nicht durch natürlichen Geburtenzuwachs erklären, auch nicht etwa durch eine starke Einwanderung: denn es ist ja bekannt, wie gerade die Länder, aus denen die meisten Lutheraner einandern, in den Einwanderungsquoten gegen die englisch redenden Nationen zurückgesetzt sind. Nein, das muß viel tiefer liegende Gründe haben.

Wenn wir nun nach den diesem Phänomen zugrunde liegenden Gründen suchen, so wollen wir uns durch eine weltliche Analogie leiten lassen. Bei einem weltlichen Verein würden wir die Gründe seines Gedeihens vor allen Dingen in seinen Prinzipien zu suchen haben; naturgemäß suchen wir also in einem kirchlichen Verein den Grund des Wachstums in den kirchlichen Prinzipien, vor allem also in der Lehre.

Was denn in der lutherischen Lehre ist es wohl, daß eine solche Anziehungskraft auf die Menschen ausübt, die solche Zunahme erklären könnte? Es kann nun natürlich nicht von mir erwartet werden, eine ganze lutherische Dogmatik zu geben; ebensowenig würde eine trockene Aufzählung aller Lehrpunkte am Platz sein, die nach meiner Ansicht für den beispiellosen Erfolg verantwortlich sind. Darum kann ich nur einzelne Punkte herausgreifen, und an denen nachweisen, was meines Erachtens der Kirche den Aufschwung verliehen hat.

1. **Die Bibel.** Wie Gott schon dem Josua sagte (Jos. 1, 8), ist das Haupterfordernis zu allem Gedeihen das Halten an Gottes Wort und Lehre. Und — man mag nun über lutherische Kirchenordnung und Verfassung denken, wie man will — das wird niemand streiten können, daß die lutherische Lehre, nicht nur über die Schrift, sondern insgesamt, der Schrift entnommen und der Schrift gemäß ist. Alle Kirchen stimmen ja offiziell mit den Lutheranern überein, daß die Heilige Schrift nicht nur Gottes Wort lehrt und enthält, sondern ganz Gottes Wort **ist.** Leider aber lassen viele modernen Kirchen dieser theoretischen Anerkennung nicht auch die praktische Anerkennung folgen, daß nur die Bibel allein einziger Grund aller Lehrtätigkeit sein darf. In der lutherischen Kirche hätte der Streit zwischen Modernisten und Fundamentalisten niemals aufkommen können. Was der Herzog von Bayern 1530 auf dem Augsburger Reichstag seinem Kanzler sagte: Es sieht so aus, als ob die Lutherischen in der Schrift sitzen, und wir daneben, das gilt „mutatis mutandis" heute noch von vielen Kirchen. „**Die Lutherischen in der Schrift,**" das ist der Hauptgrund des Wachstums der lutherischen Kirche. Der Mensch will, wenn er Sonntags zur Kirche geht, Gottes Wort hören und nicht allerlei Abhand-

lungen über Politik, Wissenschaft, soziale Reformen und so weiter. Daß die Menschen die Gewißheit haben, daß sie am Sonntag in einer lutherischen Kirche Gottes Wort hören, das zieht sie. Die Lehre von der Verbalinspiration, wie sie in einigen Synoden gepflegt wird, hat für den Lutheraner dieselbe Bedeutung, wie für den Katholiken die Lehre von der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes. Wir mögen die Lehre für irrig halten, aber wir können nicht leugnen, daß für den theologisch ungeschulten Laien eine große Anziehungskraft in dem Bewußtsein liegt, in dieser Lehre einen unfehlbaren sicheren Glaubensgrund zu haben. Dazu kommt aber die unvergleichliche Schönheit und Gewalt der Bibelübersetzung Dr. Martin Luthers, die heute noch wie vor vierhundert Jahren die Herzen in ihrem Bann hält. Wohl enthält Luthers Uebersetzung hier und da einzelne Fehler, aber von den neueren, wenn auch korrekteren, Uebersetzungen kommt keine ihr gleich in der Kraft der Wirkung auf die Herzen.

2. **Die Christologie.** Die lutherische Lehre von Jesu Christo, dem wahren Sohn Gottes, also wahrem Gott und zugleich auch wahrem Menschen, ist eine Lehre, die dem Dünkel der modernen selbstgenügsamen Gelehrsamkeit nicht entspricht, wohl aber dem Erlösungsbedürfnis des Sünders gerade das bietet, was er gebraucht. Von diesem Mittelpunkt aus ist die ganze lutherische Theologie beeinflußt. Wir dürfen sie mit Recht als christozentrisch ansprechen, während die Theologie so vieler andrer Kirchen entschieden anthropozentrisch ist. Das sind die Kirchen, in denen Bekehrung, Taufe, Bußkampf, äußerliche Heiligkeit in leiblichen Uebungen, wie in Abstinenz und ähnlichen Fündlein, den Mittelpunkt bilden, um den sich die ganze Lehre kristallisiert, oder doch wenigstens den Mittelpunkt des Interesses einnehmen. Es ist leicht zu erkennen, welchen ungeheuren Vorsprung die lutherische Kirche gewinnt, wenn sie ihrer Gliederschaft eine Erlösung verkündigt, die nicht abhängig ist von menschlichem Tun, sondern von dem göttlichen Erbarmen. Selbst die Lehre von der Gnadenwahl, die doch wohl geeignet wäre, den Menschen abzuschrecken, muß dazu dienen, die Glieder desto fester an ihre Kirche zu ketten, weil die, wenn auch nicht klar ausgesprochene, aber doch deutlich gezogene Konsequenz ist: Wir gehören zu denen durch die Gnade Auserwählten. Genug, wenn der Mensch, der Sünder, durch Revivals, Bekehrungen, äußerliche Heiligungswerke hindurchgegangen ist, ohne den ersehnten, dauernden Frieden mit Gott zu finden, dann erkennt er, daß die menschliche Tätigkeit vor Gott nichts gilt und ergreift desto begieriger die Verkündigung vom Lamm Gottes. Er legt das Hauptgewicht nicht mehr auf das: Schaffet, daß ihr selig werdet, sondern auf das: Gott ist es, der da wirket das Wollen und das Voll-

bringen. Und das ist eine weitere Ursache, warum die lutherische Lehre und Kirche gerade so viele ernsthafte Gottsucher anzieht, die in andern Kirchen den Bankerott des oberflächlichen menschlichen Strebens gesehen und mitgemacht haben.

3. **Der Mensch.** Für die Lehre von der Evolutionstheorie ist kein Raum in der lutherischen Lehre. Sie lehrt vielmehr, daß der Mensch von Gott in ursprünglicher Gerechtigkeit und Heiligkeit geschaffen ist, und zwar jeder Mensch einzeln und besonders, daß jedoch durch Adams Sündenfall dieser seine Liebesgemeinschaft mit Gott zerstört hat, und daß der natürliche Mensch diese Gemeinschaft mit Gott auf keinerlei Weise durch seine eigenen Werke wieder herstellen kann. Wohl ist das „Work out your own salvation" für den natürlichen Menschen sehr anziehend, weil er dann keine Rechenschaft Gott oder irgend jemand anders schuldig ist. Aber das seid Menschen, die noch nicht, wie Augustin sagt, bedacht haben, „quanti ponderis esset peccatum." Die lutherische Kirche aber kommt dem Heilsverlangen des aufrichtig auf seine Seligkeit bedachten Sünders durch die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben allein in hervorragendem Maß entgegen und hat dadurch nicht zum wenigsten seine große Zunahme zu verzeichnen.

Um nicht weitschweifig zu werden, dürfen wir also als den ersten Hauptgrund für das hervorragende Wachsen der lutherischen Kirche einen gesunden Orthodoxismus ansehen, der an der reinen Bibellehre festhält.

Der nächste Grund ist sodann ein gesunder Propagandismus (wenn mir diese Wortbildung erlaubt ist). Mit andern Worten: Es ist die lutherische Gemeindeschule und ihr unvergleichlicher Katechismus. Wer die Jugend hat, hat die Zukunft. Daß so viele Kirchen in ihrem Wachstum abgenommen, ja sogar an Zahlen zurückgegangen sind, mögen sie dem Umstand zuschreiben, daß sie das Interesse für die religiöse Erziehung der kommenden Generation verloren haben. Wir dürfen da die Entwicklung der Staatsschule, die religionslos ist und sein muß, für den Rückgang der Kirchenschulen verantwortlich halten. Anderseits aber sehen wir, daß die Kirchen, die das Institut der Kirchenschule treulich pflegen, die katholische und die lutherische, das größte Wachstum verzeichnen können, weil in diesen Schulen, ohne die weltlichen Fächer zu vernachlässigen, ein großer Nachdruck auf den Religionsunterricht gelegt wird. Auch das haben diese Gemeindeschulen vor den öffentlichen voraus, daß sie nicht die vielen modernen „Fads" (zu deutsch Mätzchen) pflegen. Wenn wir ausrechnen, daß in diesen Schulen die Kinder täglich wenigstens eine volle Stunde Religionsunterricht erhalten, so macht das für neun Schulmonate rund wenigstens über zweihundert Stunden Religionsunterricht, während in

den schullosen Denominationen, in denen der ganze Religionsunterricht der Sonntagschule obliegt, im besten Fall auf das ganze Jahr nur sechsundzwanzig Stunden Unterricht kommen. Gewiß ist es erfreulich, daß in vielen Kirchen und Gemeinden jetzt ein lebhaftes Interesse für die religiöse Erziehung der Kinder erwacht ist; aber was da so oft unter der Flagge religiöse Erziehung segelt, ist doch oft sehr bedenklich. Wenn man die Curricula, die absichtlich modern sein wollen, ansieht, so schüttelt man den Kopf. Kirchengeschichte, Mission und Biographien großer Männer sind ja gewiß sehr nötig und nützlich zu wissen; aber das alles kann nicht den Platz des Religionsunterrichts einnehmen. Für solche Themata empfehlen wir den Jugendverein; für die kirchliche, religiöse Erziehung nehmen die Lutheraner den einzig richtigen Standpunkt ein: Bibel und Katechismus. Wenn moderne Sonntagschulgrößen sich weigern, die Bibel als einzigen Lehrgrund anzuerkennen, darf man nicht erstaunen, daß fromme Eltern ihre Kinder lieber in einer Schule und Sonntagschule wissen wollen, die auf dem Schriftgrund steht wie die lutherische.

Der Katechismus Luthers! Ja, wenn nur eine einzige Kirche irgend etwas hätte, was diesem Meisterwerke auch nur von weitem zu vergleichen wäre, oder was ihm das Wasser reichen dürfte! Vergleichen wir irgendeinen Katechismus, den unsern, den Heidelberger, den Westminster oder sonst einen englischen mit Luthers Buch, so stellen wir eine Talgkerze neben eine Edisonsche elektrische Lampe. Sei es mir erlaubt, ein Zeugnis der weltlichen Literatur für die Schätzung des Kleinen Katechismus anzuführen. Unser Dr. F. Mayer schreibt in „Der Waldpfarrer am Schoharie" (Seite 75): „Jeden Augenblick ist ein Dutzend von ihnen bereit, sich für ihre Bibel und ihren Katechismus . . . . totschlagen zu lassen." Mit vollem Recht kann die lutherische Kirche in diesem Jahr das vierhundertjährige Jubiläum des Erscheinens des Kleinen Katechismus feiern; denn ohne denselben wäre sie nie das geworden, was sie jetzt ist.

Als dritten Grund für das Zunehmen der lutherischen Kirche führe ich an, daß sie sich eines gesunden, schriftgemäßen Konfessionalismus rühmen darf. Eine Kirche muß für etwas eintreten, sich mit etwas identifizieren. Das ist ihre „raison d'être," der Grund ihrer Existenzberechtigung. Die Glieder einer Kirche müssen wissen, wenn sie den Namen der Kirche hören, was sie von ihr und in ihr erwarten dürfen. An diesem Prinzip hält die lutherische Kirche unentwegt fest. Sie würde sich niemals in einen Merger mit andern Kirchen einlassen, die nicht das Augsburger Bekenntnis von 1530 rückhaltlos unterschreiben. Würde irgendeine Kirche das Verlangen nach einer Vereinigung mit der lutheri-

schen tragen, so wäre eine beiderseitige Konzession, ein Kompromiß undenkbar. Eine solche Zumutung würde jeder lutherische Pastor, jede lutherische Synode mit der allergrößten Entschiedenheit auf das weiteste von sich weisen. Und das ist ihr zum Segen gediehen. Das „U. A. C.," das Schiboleth mancher lutherischen Synoden, hat viel zu ihrem Wachstum beigetragen. Die Leute kennen diese Buchstaben, wenn sie auch ihre Bedeutung nicht voll ermessen können. Kommen sie dann in eine andre Stadt und sehen diese Buchstaben an einer Kirche, so wissen sie, daß das ihre Kirche ist. Zu der gehen sie und halten sich an sie; während sie ohne diese drei magischen Buchstaben sich vielleicht irgendeiner andern Kirche zugesellen würden.

Eine Verschmelzung kleinerer Synoden ist ja auch in der lutherischen Kirche vielfach vorgekommen, aber immer nur unter solchen, die sich in der Lehre unbedingt einig sind oder wissen. Eine Vereinigung mit der Reformierten Kirche würde die lutherische Kirche 1929 ebenso unbedingt und entschieden ablehnen, wie sie es 1529 in Marburg getan hat. Ihr habt einen andern Geist wie wir, das gilt noch heute. Man mag das beklagen und für unberechtigt erklären. Es ist aber nicht meine Aufgabe, die lutherische Stellung anzugreifen oder zu verteidigen, sondern „sine ira et studio" zu erklären, woher meines Erkennens nach ihr Wachstum stammt. Ein Professor an einem lutherischen Predigerseminar schrieb mir vor einiger Zeit:

"Men have their convictions in science and in business. Without them no progress could be made. If my convictions do not accord with those of another man, that is no reason why I should hate him and persecute him. Why not come together in the spirit of Christ and compare our views? That is the only way to arrive at a true unity. *Such a unity will never be secured by coming together with enthusiasm and to exclaim: "Let us have peace."* No one is more in favor of genuine unity than I, but I am convinced that this happy condition *can only be secured on the basis of the authoritative Word of God.*"

(Die betreffenden Worte sind nicht vom Schreiber, sondern von mir unterstrichen.)

Und ich muß sagen: Der Mann hat Recht. Wie Moltke es wollte: Getrennt marschieren und vereint schlagen, das ist der vielgeschmähte lutherische Konfessionalismus. Laß andre nach der ihnen gegebenen Erkenntnis für ihren Meister wirken, aber der Lutheraner hält sich ferne von dem gewaltsamen und gemachten Synkretismus „a tout prix" nach der Weise: „Und willst du nicht mein Bruder sein, so schlag ich dir den Schädel ein." Ein solcher Standpunkt aber hat unbestreitbar Anziehungskraft auf das Volk. Ich rede hier nicht den verkehrten Folgerungen des Konfessionalis-

mus das Wort, daß man nur in der einen Partikularkirche das Heil finden kann, wie man es ja leider hört; aber selbst diese unberechtigte Ausdehnung des konfessionalistischen Prinzips hat sicher ihren Einfluß ausgeübt auf die Erweiterung der Gliederzahl der lutherischen Synoden.

Als den dritten, und durchaus nicht unbedeutenden, Grund des Wachsens erwähnen wir den in der lutherischen Kirche vorherrschenden gesunden Konservatismus. Die Treue gegen die althergebrachten Sitten trägt viel dazu bei, der lutherischen Kirche ihre Glieder zu erhalten und neue zu gewinnen. Ein Erlebnis aus eigener Erfahrung mag dazu dienen, als Beweis dafür angeführt zu werden: Ich war zu einer Taufe bestellt worden. Der eine zur Patenschaft auserwählte Mann war nicht erschienen und hatte nur seine Frau gesandt. Die Not war groß: ein männlicher Pate fehlte. Als ich aber der Frau vorschlug, die Frau des fehlenden Mannes für ihn eintreten zu lassen, erhielt ich die entrüstete Antwort: Wie können Sie mir zumuten, so meinen Glauben zu verleugnen und bei meinem Knaben zwei Frauen als Paten zu haben? Draußen in ihrem pommerschen Heimatsdorf war es so Sitte gewesen, und so wollte sie es auch hier haben. Ich verlor die Familie, die sich den Lutheranern anschloß. Wir wissen alle, daß die Zeremonien zu den Adiaphora gehören, aber die Laien wissen es nicht. Die kirchlichen Gebräuche kennzeichnen die Individualität der Kirche. Genau, wie die katholische Kirche durch den sinnbetäubenden Glanz und Prunk der Messe ihre Glieder bei sich behält und auf naive Gemüter einen tiefgehenden Einfluß ausübt, so hat auch die lutherische Liturgie einen gewaltigen Einfluß. Sie ermöglicht es den Gottesdienstbesuchern an dem Gottesdienst sich aktiv beteiligen zu können. Und tatsächlich ist die schlichte, würdige Liturgie der Lutheraner dem unstreitbar nüchterneren Gottesdienst der reformiert gerichteten Kirchen weit überlegen. Man hat das in diesen Kirchen empfunden und dafür das gemeinsam abwechselnde Bibellesen eingeführt. Aber das wirkt, wenn es regelmäßig durchgeführt wird, monoton gegenüber dem reichen Schatz der lutherischen Responsorien und Antiphonien. Wird es aber nicht konsequent durchgeführt, wie ja jede Gemeinde ihre eigenen Moden und Sitten hat, so mag es für die einzelnen Gottesdienste ganz verschieden sein, daß also heute das alternierende Lesen auf dem Programm steht, dann aber wieder vielleicht in vier bis fünf Wochen nicht, sodaß die Gemeindeglieder nicht wissen, was die Willkür des Predigers ihnen für einen Gottesdienst an dem Sonntag bescheren mag. In der lutherischen Kirche aber ist es einen Sonntag wie den andern, doch ohne Monotonität, mit einer schönen würdigen Liturgie, deren Einfluß auf die Gemeinde wir nicht unterschätzen dürfen.

Auch in der Hymnologie hat sich die lutherische Kirche einen gesunden Konservatismus bewahrt. Die alten Kernlieder der Reformation werden mit Eifer und Hingebung gepflegt, und so vieler Liederschund der neumodischen Tingeltangelei bleibt ein für allemal ausgeschlossen. Wo ein Pastor sich mit Treue und Verständnis an die Liturgie und die alten Stammlieder der Kirche hält, da werden wir gesunden Fortschritt und Achtung der Kirche finden. Es ist ja gewiß zu beklagen, daß die große Masse, die hoi polloi, die Lehre nicht nach Gebühr zu schätzen weiß; aber sie können die Befolgung der Kirchensitten sehen und schätzen die Kirche am höchsten, die sich am treusten an dem althergebrachten hält.

Als letzten Grund für die große Ausbreitung der lutherischen Kirche führe ich an, daß viele der Glieder aus Ländern herkommen, in denen die lutherische Kirche weit verbreitet ist, also Deutschland, Dänemark, Schweden und Norwegen. Ihre Ahnen waren lutherisch, so sind sie es denn auch. Jedoch halte ich diesen Grund für den am wenigsten stichhaltigen; denn es sind ja nicht alle Einwanderer aus lutherischen Gegenden gekommen. Warum wachsen denn die Reformierten nicht in der gleichen oder wenigstens ähnlicher Weise? Es kommen doch genügend Engländer in das Land; warum wächst denn die anglikanische Hochkirche nicht in demselben Prozentsatz?

Zudem besagt die Statistik der lutherischen Kirche (Lutheran World Almanac 1921, p. 211), daß von 106,000,000 Einwohnern der U. S. A. 17,000,000 von lutherischen Voreltern stammen, daß aber, Sonntagschüler eingerechnet, nur 3,500,000 Lutheraner im Land waren (1921). Die Kirche hat also entschieden eine recht große Anzahl von Gliedern an die Sekten abgeben müssen. Viele haben wohl auch im Land der Freiheit den alten Glauben ganz über Bord geworfen und sind unter den kirchlich unversorgten oder unter den mit keiner Kirche in Verbindung Stehenden zu suchen. Wären sie alle treu geblieben, so hätte das Wachstum der lutherischen Kirche ein noch viel gewaltigeres sein müssen.

Aber selbst so, wie es ist, eingeschränkt und modifiziert durch den Abfall so vieler Glieder, kann die lutherische Kirche uns Gliedern andrer Kirchenkörpern eine lebendige Mahnung und Warnung sein. Eine Mahnung, festzuhalten an den bewährten Prinzipien des Evangeliums der Evangelischen Kirche, durch die wir durch Gottes Gnade soweit geführt sind, und eine Warnung uns nicht einzulassen, auf unerprobte, neumodische, menschliche, also nicht schriftgemäße Experimente. Wir sagen nicht: Gottes Wort und Luthers Lehr vergehn nun und nimmermehr; wohl aber wollen wir durch diesen Vergleich lernen: Allein und einzig **Gottes Wort** wird bleiben jetzt und immerfort.

Wird der Gedanke: meine Nächsten und Freunde seien ohne Begnadigung gestorben, meine Seligkeit nicht stören?

Pastor E. Schweizer.

Diese Sorge und Frage hat stets viele beunruhigt, daß selbst chinesische Schulkinder sich damit beschäftigten und ein wilder Kaffer es vorzog mit seinen Vorfahren in der Hölle als ohne sie im Himmel zu sein. Er hatte den Missionar, dem er zuhörte, gefragt, wo denn seine heidnischen Verwandten und Freunde hingekommen seien, und bekam zur Antwort: in die Hölle! Nun konnte der Wilde sich eine Seligkeit nicht vorstellen bei dem Gedanken, seine Angehörigen seien unglücklich. Mit Recht. — Die **katholische Kirche** hat dieser Sorge abzuhelfen und um die Toten bekümmerten Leute zu trösten versucht mit der Lehre vom Purgatorium (Reinigungsort, Fegfeuer) und von dem Ablaß und den Seelenmessen. Die Absolution verleiht die Vergebung der Sünden in Kraft des Blutes Christi und schützt vor den ewigen Strafen der Sünde. Die zeitlichen Strafen müssen im sogenannten Fegfeuer verbüßt werden, was aber lange dauern kann. Durch den Ablaß und die Seelenmessen kann man die Qualen des Fegfeuers mildern, abkürzen, daraus erlösen und in den Himmel versetzen. Das war ein heilloser Betrug. Das Volk aber freute sich der Hilfe und bezahlte willig für die wertlosen Ablaßzettel und die nicht viel besseren Seelenmessen. Man kann aber daraus sehen, daß das Schicksal der Nächsten nach ihrem Tod den Ihrigen nicht gleichgültig ist und die Liebe gern tut zu ihrer Rettung, was sie nur immer kann.

Die Reformation, besonders Luther, hat das Fegfeuer gelöscht und die Lehre von einem Zwischenzustand mit einer Entwicklung als Irrlehre erklärt. Da gebe es keine Veränderungen, keine Bekehrungen und Rettungen der ohne Begnadigung Gestorbenen. Wie der Mensch in den Tod gekommen, bleibe er; und sein Los sei entweder der Himmel oder die Hölle. Für die Toten könne man nichts tun; nicht einmal für sie beten: an ihrem Schicksal sei nichts zu ändern.

Diese schroffe Lehre hat viele fromme Herzen schwer bekümmert und betrübt. In seinem „Credo" erzählt Dr. Ludwig Schneller: „Auf meiner Seereise lernte ich einen höheren Offizier kennen, eine prächtige, soldatische Erscheinung. Wir waren Tischnachbarn. Es ist etwas Eigenes um eine solche gemeinsame Seefahrt. Man kommt einander näher als sonst. Die unruhigen, lärmenden Stimmen des Festlandes sind verstummt. Manches wacht auf im Herzen und kommt in einer vertrauten Stunde wohl auch zum Ausdruck. Der Offizier war durch Gottes gnädige Fügung ein gläubiger Christ geworden und war glücklich darüber. Aber einen Kummer

trug er im Herzen. Er hatte eine Mutter gehabt, die er fast leidenschaftlich geliebt hatte. Sie war der gute Engel seiner Kindheit und Jugend gewesen. Er wußte nicht genug zu rühmen, was für eine gute Mutter sie ihm und seinen Geschwistern gewesen. Sie war reich gewesen auf mannigfaltigen geistigen Interessen. Aber Jesus war ihr ein Fremder geblieben. In ihren Kreisen war er ihr niemals näher gebracht worden. Und so ist sie gestorben. Er erzählte, er habe später seinen Pastor gefragt, ob nun seine Mutter verdammt sei. Der habe ihm zwar teilnehmend, aber bestimmt erklärt: wenn sie nicht an Jesum geglaubt habe, dann sei sie verdammt. Darauf habe er schmerzvoll geantwortet: ‚Dann kann ich selbst der ewigen Seligkeit niemals froh werden!' Da habe ihn der Mann getröstet: ‚Sorgen Sie sich darum nicht. Ihre Seligkeit wird so groß sein, daß sie durch die Qual der Verdammten nicht gestört werden kann.' Das war eine **harte Orthodoxie,** die weder in der Bibel, noch im apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnis einen Grund hat. Den Mann habe ich auf den trostvollen Artikel im Glaubensbekenntnis hingewiesen: ‚Niedergefahren zur Hölle.' (Gemeint ist Hades — Totenreich). Und nie werde ich vergessen, welchen Eindruck das auf ihn machte, wie diese Worte, richtig erklärt, wie Balsam auf seine Seele fielen. Aber fast vorwurfsvoll fragte er schließlich: ‚Warum predigen Sie nicht öfters über diese Dinge? Glauben Sie mir, eine Menge Menschen sehnt sich nach einem solchen Wort.'" Soweit Dr. Schneller.

Warum aber wird nicht von einer jenseitigen Seelenpflege und Entwicklung gepredigt und geschrieben? Fürchtet man etwa in den Geruch der Ketzerei oder Schwärmerei zu geraten, oder dem Romanismus Konzessionen zu machen? Man hat mich schon gefragt, ob ich ans Fegfeuer glaube? Durchaus nicht, aber an ein Sanatorium und an eine großartiges Seelenrettungswerk.

Sagt man: da werden manche die Buße hinausschieben und sich auf jenseitige Hilfe verlassen. Das wäre ein Leichtsinn, der nicht ungestraft bliebe. Aber möglich ist solcher Unverstand. Wie schmählich ist die Lehre von der Gerechtigkeit durch den Glauben aus Gnaden mißbraucht worden; aber deswegen predigt man doch nicht Pharisäismus. Mit der Lehre von einer jenseitigen Gnadenanstalt stehen wir besser als die Philosophen, die manches sagen müssen, was sie nicht wissen, damit sie ein lückenloses System bekommen. Unsre Lehre hat Schriftgrund. Jesus selbst hat bezeugt, daß es noch eine Vergebung gebe „in jener Welt." Und wenn Jesus hinabgestiegen ist ins Totenreich, so ist das **ein Teil seines Erlösungswerkes.** Darum sagt auch Petrus in seinem ersten Brief (3, 19), daß Jesus „hingegangen ist und hat gepredigt den Geistern im Gefängnis," und wiederum (4, 16), daß auch den Toten

das Evangelium verkündigt worden sei. Dr. Ludwig Schneller setzt hinzu: „Der Apostel redet hier von den Zeitgenossen des Noah, der gottlosesten, schlimmsten und verdorbensten Generation der Vorzeit, von der die Bibel zu berichten weiß. Aber selbst zu ihr, sagt er, ist Jesus hingegangen, um ihr zu predigen und das Evangelium zu verkündigen, um die Pforten ihres Gefängnisses zu sprengen, um auch ihr einen Weg zur Seligkeit zu öffnen. Wenn aber selbst jene gottlose Generation noch dieser Gnade teilhaft geworden ist, wie vielmehr alle andern Generationen! Nicht nur der Menschheit seit Christi Geburt, auch den harrenden Generationen der Vorzeit sollen die Segnungen der auf Golgatha vollbrachten Erlösung zugänglich gemacht werden." Millionen sind hinübergegangen, die von Jesus nichts wissen konnten, und darunter viele edle und fromme Leute. Tausende gehen täglich hinüber, die mit dem Heiland nicht bekannt geworden sind, und darunter zahllose Kinder, Blödsinnige, Geisteskranke, und die sollten drüben nicht Belehrung und Pflege finden, sondern verloren und in die Hölle geworfen werden. Das wäre eine herzlose, beschränkte und ungöttliche Theologie.

Als Zwingli die Hoffnung aussprach, daß die frommen griechischen Weisen, ein Plato, Aristoteles und andre noch in jenem Leben zur Erkenntnis Christi kommen und selig werden würden, da wurde er von den Lutheranern jener Zeit verhöhnt. Die Wahrheit ist aber immer auf Seiten der Barmherzigkeit und Gerechtigkeit. Gott ist barmherziger und gerechter als die Menschen sind. Gott hat die **Welt** geliebt und die Welt mit sich selbst versöhnt. Die Liebe und Gerechtigkeit Gottes, sowie der Tod Jesu am Kreuz bürgen dafür, daß die Gnade nicht **eine** Seele versäumen, sondern alles tun wird, was immer möglich ist, um sie für Gott und das ewige Leben zu gewinnen. Nun kann ich auch noch für meine Nächsten und Freunde, die ohne Begnadigung gestorben sind, hoffen und für sie beten. Aber es sollte niemand es wagen, ohne Vergebung und Frieden mit Gott sich zum Sterben zu schicken. Die Nachlässigkeit bringt unter das Gericht des Wortes: „Gottes Zorn vom Himmel her wird geoffenbart über alles gottlose Wesen und Ungerechtigkeit der Menschen, die die Wahrheit in Ungerechtigkeit aufhalten," und gegen besseres Wissen und Gewissen in Unbußfertigkeit verbleiben. „Irret euch nicht: Gott läßt sich nicht spotten." Wer Jesum kennt, ist verpflichtet, an ihn zu glauben und seine Gebote zu halten. Auch drüben wird keiner zum Glauben gezwungen, sowenig wie hier. Sie werden Hindernisse überwinden und sich entscheiden müssen, wobei die Liebe zur Wahrheit und das Sehnen nach Gott sehr in Betracht kommen wird.

Man nimmt aber nicht bloß die Sorge um die ohne Begna-

digung Gestorbenen Nächsten mit hinüber: man bringt selbst noch etwas mit, was drüben noch der Korrektur bedarf — irrige Vorstellungen und auch noch üble Gewohnheiten. Man ist nicht vollkommen geheiligt. Aber auch nur ein Rest von Sündigkeit läßt die Gemeinschaft mit Gott nicht völlig werden und trübt die Freude. Was die Gnade hinieden an uns tut, ist angefangenes Werk: Stückwerk, mehr oder weniger unvollkommen.

Auch müssen die Seligen sich beteiligen am Kampf des Lichtes mit der Finsternis. Die Siege des Evangeliums werden im Himmel gefeiert, Niederlagen verursachen Bekümmernis. Glauben, Hoffnung und Geduld haben Proben zu bestehen. Christus selbst liegt im Kampf mit den Mächten der Finsternis, mit dem Fürsten dieser Welt und kommt nicht zur Ruhe, bis er alle feindliche Herrschaft, Gewalt und Obrigkeit aufgehoben hat und ihm alle Feinde zu Füßen gelegt sind, bis ihm überhaupt alles untertan ist. „Der letzte Feind, der aufgehoben wird, ist der Tod." Das geschieht in der letzten Auferstehung (1. Kor. 15, 24—27). Dann ist Christi Werk der Erlösung und Wiederbringung vollendet: der Sohn übergibt sein Reich dem Vater und wird selbst dem Vater untertan: auf **daß Gott sei alles in allen.**

Das ist der herrliche Abschluß der Weltgeschichte: das siegreiche Ende des Jahrtausende langen Kampfes des Lichtes mit der Finsternis. Gott hat sein Ziel erreicht, sein Schöpfungsplan ist realisiert. Gott schlägt sein Heiligtum auf inmitten der erlösten Menschheit (Offb. 21, 1—7). Das Volk Gottes ist zur Ruhe gekommen. Der Glaube ist Schauen geworden und die Hoffnungen sind erfüllt. Sorgen und Wünsche gibt es nicht mehr. Die Zeit ist nicht mehr; es gibt keine Veränderungen mehr; kein Abfall und keine Bekehrung der Gottlosen. „Gelobt sei Jesus Christ von allen Ueberwindern!" Denn ihm haben Gott und Menschen den seligen Ausgang zu verdanken und alle werden den Sohn ehren, wie sie den Vater ehren. Wer klug ist, bittet um Gnade zum Glauben an Jesum. Denn mit ihm im Bund sind wir geborgen und selig, wo immer wir sind, und wie immer es uns geht. Nach Offb. 21, 8 sind nicht alle in die Stadt Gottes aufgenommen. Es geschieht ihnen kein Unrecht. Wer könnte sie bedauern und ohne sie nicht selig sein?

Die dem Herrn angehören: die Gerechten, gehen unter allerlei Namen hinüber. Nun gibt es kein Paradies und keinen Himmel für die Katholiken, für die Lutheraner und andre Parteien, für jede Sekte extra. Es ist auch keine von den verschiedenen Glaubensgemeinschaften die alleinseligmachende Kirche. In allen Herden hat der gute Hirte seine Schafe, und es gilt, was Paulus geschrieben: „Hier ist kein Jude noch Grieche; hier ist kein Sklave

noch Freier; hier ist kein Mann noch Weib; denn ihr seid allzumal Einer in Christo Jesu." Aber wird sich das Einsein in Christo, die Gemeinschaft der Heiligen, im Paradies ohne Schwierigkeit vollziehen? Verena, die fromme katholische Gastwirtin Pastor O. Funkes in Engelberg, Unterwalden, hatte große Achtung vor seiner Frömmigkeit und bedauerte es schmerzlich, daß er nicht zur alleinseligmachenden Kirche gehöre. So leid es ihr tat, sie konnte nicht glauben, daß sie im Himmel einander wieder sehen würden. Wie werden nun die frommen Seelen aus allerlei Sekten drüben sich wundern, wenn sie auch Ketzer, Anders- und Irrgläubige als Begnadigte sehen und mit ihnen in Gemeinschaft stehen müssen? So ist selbst auch das Paradies ein Sanatorium mit noch nicht vollkommen idealen Zuständen. Diese treten erst mit der Reichsvollendung ein. Doch sind selig die Toten, die im Herrn sterben noch vor ihrer Auferstehung, Verklärung und Aufnahme in die Herrlichkeit." Sie werden nicht hungern und dürsten; es fehlt ihnen nichts; es wird auch auf sie nicht fallen die Sonne oder irgendeine Hitze; es quält sie nichts, denn das Lamm wird sie weiden und leiten zu den Wasserbrunnen des Lebens, und Gott wird abwischen alle Tränen von ihren Augen." Sie sind von allem Uebel erlöst.

EDITORIALS

AT THE MUSKOKA LAKES

We had not had a vacation for many years. Nearly all the evangelical pastors of our city had gradually acquired the habit of leaving their congregations to themselves for a period of from 2-4 weeks, in the summer, while we stuck to our post year in and out. Our reasons were more financial than conscientious. We have arrived at a stage when thoughts for the future are pressing, and the Pension Board is so far unable to provide much of the "nervous rerum" for this future. Nevertheless we came to the conclusion this year that while there is a time to save there is also a time to spend, if the spending is done wisely. So we decided on a vacation. Up here where we live Canada is the great vacation Eldorado. Some go there because they want to fish in the innumerable Canadian lakes; some want to roam in its forests; and some are even thinking of other attractions, which we need not specify.

The writer is no fisher-man—he has never caught a fish in his life—he does not take any delight in "roughing it" in virgin forests. But he is a lover of nature; he likes the quietness of the woods, provided there is a regular path through it, affording comfort and safety. And, of course, he enjoys to look upon nature's lovely sceneries. When a person lives in the noise and amid the throng of a large city all year, the escape into nature's peace is a veritable God-send to him.

We found all we were looking for on the banks of one of the Muskoka Lakes—Lake Joseph. There are many hotels built on the prettiest places of these lakes. One of these is Elgin House. Here we cast anchor and spent two delightful weeks there. This kind of a vacation is very different from that of the multitude. We know plenty of people whose idea of a vacation is to see something new every day. Their daily average is 275 miles and they sleep in a different place every night. Whosoever may call this a vacation, we call it an intolerable hardship. It takes a tough constitution to stand it, and where does the mind find time and mood for reflection?

At Elgin House our bodily needs were well taken care of. Our time we put in on golfing, tennis, lawn-bowling, swimming, boating, lake excursions, and so forth. Some of us liked to take long walks along the paths of the silent forest: how body and mind and nerves seemed to revel in these unwonted pleasures. How inexpressibly

beautiful the mornings were when the charming landscape unfolded before us in the gentle rays of the early day; how restful, again, the evenings when the sun sank in the west and the dusk very slowly and gradually changed into darkness.

The hotel accommodated 400 people and was always filled. The crowd was congenial. The owner of the hotel has had it for many years and has given it a certain character. The Sabbath is very strictly kept—no golf or bowling then—and there was service every Sunday morning and evening. These services, held in a separate chapel, were well attended. To a minister it is an unusual privilege to sit in at such a service, in the place of a listener, not in the pulpit. The first Sunday morning we had a man there from Philadelphia, the chairman of some mission board. He preached on "Magnifying Christ," on the basis of Philippians 1, 20. His sermon was a marvel of exegetical skill, a real exposition of the words of scripture; his diction was carefully chosen, without being over-elaborate, weeding out every superfluous word. We were deeply impressed with it. On the following Sunday an Episcopal rector from Indianapolis spoke. His text was the "Great Invitation," Matt. 11: 28-30. He was very different from the former speaker. Intellectually, the first one was far superior to him, but the rector had a very pleasing, fatherly personality and was very practical in the application of his text. We preferred the man from Philadelphia as a speaker; but when the rector's sermon was later discussed, the unanimous verdict of the others were for the Episcopalian; the first man's discourse had left them cold. To us this seemed very significant. It appears when we want to make an impression in the pulpit, loyalty to the text is a secondary matter as long as you come close to the life of the people.

After the evening service the people—or many of them, men, women and children—gathered in the parlors and sang church-hymns, of their own volition and selection, for a whole hour. Where in the whole of the United States could such an experience be duplicated? It is unmistakable the people of Canada think more of their church than the Americans. Incidentally we heard that the United Church of Canada is a success. We got the impression that the spirit of denominationalism is dying out there, without detriment to the vital things of the Christian faith.

When our time was up we were ready to go, to be sure. At the same time we felt that the two weeks up there were the finest we had in years, and that physically and mentally we should long reap benefit from them. We reached Toronto and Hamilton in the late evening of the first day back. The next day we went by way of London, Ont., to Port Stanley on Lake Erie. Here we took the

boat across the lake to Cleveland. It was on the passengers of this boat that we noticed the first effects of Canadian liquor. Up in Canada we had not seen any drunken people, and Elgin House is strictly "temperance."

THE ORDER OF WORSHIP

The other day we attended an evening service at the leading Baptist church of this city. They had been searching the United States and Canada for a new minister and now, after two years of hard work, they had found him. The service had 13 numbers, the sermon was No. 12, and with No. 13, the benediction, it closed. There were hymns and anthems and prayers galore, "coming events" (announcements), offering and scripture reading. Had there not been a new minister it would have been impossible to keep up a mood of expectation for the sermon without fatigue and impatience. It reminded us vividly of an article in the "Christian Century" (Aug. 7), entitled "Turn it around!" In it Charles M. Sheldon (the author of "In His Steps") puts his finger on this same sore spot in the arrangement of most American services. He gives a sample of the average church service; it has 15 numbers, the sermon coming as No. 14, followed by the benediction. He takes the position that the sermon is the most important part of the service and that all that goes before is to create an adequate atmosphere for the hearing of the sermon. In his opinion, however, a hodge podge of 13 numbers cannot do this. A congregation whose members, perhaps, just come from the reading of the Sunday paper cannot be put in the proper mental receptivity by a long program of introductory material. He recommends, therefore, to turn the whole thing around, i.e., to put the sermon first and the rest of the service after it. "Create the spirit of worship with the sermon instead of trying to create a spirit of worship leading up to the sermon. Quicken a sleepy and dull congregation into mental and moral and spiritual awareness by an appeal to life which will bring about an attitude, after the sermon, of warmth and spiritual vigor." His program would begin with a hymn and then, at once, give the sermon.

Sheldon's suggestion has been favorably received as we see in a later number of the "Christian Century." We should not be surprised if even some of our clergy had tried it. For many of our progressive brethren are only too eager to learn from their American contemporaries. We have noticed in the past that the customs of the English churches have been largely adopted by many of our ministers. Not only do they expect their congregations to rise when they sing and sit down when they pray. They also have

introduced the offering before the sermon and make their announcements just before the sermon hymn. In that way they have brought into their churches the same evils that Sheldon and others now complain about. To us their innovations have seemed mistakes right along, while they in all probability believed to be marching with the times, until now Sheldon may bring them to their senses. If offering and announcements (all kinds of announcements) are made before the sermon, people are kept in suspense too long and thoughts are scattered in all directions instead of being held together for the supreme task of the day. The sermon is the climax of the service and what goes before is to get the people in the right mood for its reception. After that climax has been reached, the mind is bound to relax, and in that stage of relaxation offering and announcements find their proper place.

To follow Sheldon, however, and begin with the sermon would be a psychological and liturgical *faux pas*. All that follows after, i.e., from 10-12 numbers, would be in the nature of an anticlimax. The main thing has been attended to, the rest does not count. Besides, if the people, as Sheldon says, come to the service in a spiritually dull and indifferent frame of mind, they ought to be stirred up and prepared for spiritual things. That can best be done by a service of song, in which they are *active,* not by listening to a discourse which is a more passive attitude of mind.

In addition to all this, we should say that the liturgical structure of the service is governed by inherent laws. In it the spiritual elements of repentance, faith, praise, confession are to find suitable expression. In song and prayer the human contribution has first place, to give way then to the exposition of God's word, so that an appropriate rythm of the human and divine is secured. To turn this whole program around arbitrarily, in the supposed interest of better results, would do violence to all heretofore recognized ideals of church worship.

To find a larger place and a better expression for the element of worship in our church services, is one of the great needs of the church in all lands. To bring this about, the so-called "liturgical" churches will have to teach us. They have a long experience in it and a greater aptitude for it; the non-liturgical churches have nothing to offer in this connection. No wonder that many of them are therefore ready to learn from those that have.

Lehre und Leben.

Es ist unleugbar, daß in dem Verhältnis zwischen Lehre und Leben heute der Ton überwiegend und zunehmend auf das Leben fällt. In unserm Land sind es — von kleinen Sekten abgesehen — fast nur die Lutheraner, die unentwegt für den Sieg der reinen **Lehre** kämpfen. Sie gehen von dem Grundsatz aus, daß das Leben immer unvollkommen ist, daß aber die Lehre, von göttlicher Offenbarung stammend, ohne Fehl ist, und es darum die Sache der Kirche ist, diese Lehre rein und lauter aus der Schrift zu erheben. Aus der reinen, schriftgemäßen Lehre wird sich dann auf dem Weg der gläubigen Annahme das christliche Leben entfalten. Nach ihnen ist Luther die unübertreffliche Lehrautorität, und in der Augsburgischen Konfession (unverändert) ist das System der lutherischen Lehre niedergelegt. Was diese Konfession als schriftgemäß und heilsnotwendig erklärt, ist für alle Zeiten das Glaubensfundament der Kirche. Davon ist nichts abzunehmen und es ist nichts hinzuzufügen. Als eine Folge davon hat zum Beispiel das „Social Gospel," sonst überall als die Forderung der Zeit begrüßt, bei den Lutheranern strenger Observanz keinen Eingang gefunden.

Die reformierten Kirchen, das heißt die Kirchen des Kalvinismus, waren von vornherein anders eingestellt. Lag bei Luther der Ton auf der Predigt des Evangeliums, so bei Kalvin auf der durch das Evangelium gewonnenen Gemeinde. Fordert Luther den Glauben, so Kalvin die Werke als Frucht des Glaubens. Ist das Luthertum fruchtbar gewesen in dem Gebiet der Dogmatik, so die Reformierten auf dem der Ethik. Aus diesem Zug erklärt sich auch die reformierte Forderung nach Freiheit und Unabhängigkeit der Kirche, sowie ihr Einfluß auf das öffentliche Leben, während die Lutheraner „leidentlichen" Gehorsam gegen die Obrigkeit gepredigt und sich vom öffentlichen Leben fern gehalten haben. Es soll nicht gesagt werden, daß die Reformierten nicht auch erbitterte Lehrstreitigkeiten gehabt haben, sondern nur daß bei ihnen die Entwicklung im ganzen in der eben bezeichneten Richtung verlaufen ist.

Der Geist des modernen Kalvinismus ist im amerikanischen Protestantismus fast alleinherrschend. Es ist deutlich wahrzunehmen, daß beinahe in allen Kirchen eine weitgehende **Lehrerweichung** vorhanden ist. Wir hören es alle Tage, daß das Christentum eine neue Lebensführung verlangt (a „way of life"), nicht Annahme einer bestimmten Lehre. Es handle sich darum, den Geist, die Gesinnung Christi zu haben, was auch immer man glaube von seiner Gottheit und Versöhnung. Wir brauchten die Religion Jesu, sein Gottvertrauen und seine Menschenliebe, nicht eine Religion, eine religiöse Ansicht bezüglich Jesu („the religion of Jesus, not

a religion about Jesus"). Was unsre Zeit benötige, sei nicht ein dogmatisches Christentum, sondern ein lebendiger Glaube, der die menschliche Gesellschaft erneuern könne. Nur wenn die Kirchen ihre theologischen Bindungen abstreifen oder in den Hintergrund rücken, könne die große Kirchenunion zustande kommen; nur dann könne die Kirche das Instrument der Aufrichtung des Reiches Gottes in der Welt werden.

Man lese in „Christian World" (Seite 460) den Aufsatz „Fosdick and Channing," und man wird sehen, wie Petrie (der Verfasser desselben) triumphierend feststellt, daß der heutige Protestantismus in seinen Führern die theologischen Lehren früherer Zeiten zum alten Eisen geworfen hat und wesentlich auf dem Standpunkt der Unitarier angelangt ist. Petrie mag etwas zuviel für den Sieg seiner Sache beanspruchen, aber es ist viel Wahrheit in dem, was er sagt.

Daß er im ganzen richtig urteilt, wird weithin zugestanden. Was immer man vom Fundamentalismus denkt, die Bewegung würde nie die Stoßkraft gehabt haben, wenn nicht in der Tat wichtige Positionen des christlichen Glaubens unter Feuer gewesen wären. Im allgemeinen versucht man dem Streit der Meinungen dadurch die Spitze abzubrechen, daß man Lehrkontoverse als unfruchtbare Zeitvergeudung von der Debatte ausschließt. Bischöfe und andre Leiter wissen mit diplomatischer Geschicklichkeit den Kurs so zu lenken, daß doktrinelle Klippen beiseite gelassen werden. Es kommt ihnen dabei die Tatsache zu statten, daß der Amerikaner — Pastor oder Laie — praktisch gerichtet ist, und sich nur wenige wegen intellektueller Probleme graue Haare wachsen lassen.

Jedoch sind damit die Schwierigkeiten nicht gehoben. Wir können freilich nicht wie die Lutheraner unsern Pastoren eine theologische Zwangsjacke anlegen. Wir können von ihnen nicht den Glauben an die Verbalinspiration der Bibel verlangen. (Noch kürzlich auf dem lutherischen Weltkonvent zu Kopenhagen ist Dr. Hein, der Präsident der Allgemeinen Synode von Ohio und andern Staaten, für die Göttlichkeit der Schrift im Sinn absoluter Irrtumslosigkeit eingetreten. Man dürfe nicht unterschieden zwischen göttlichem und menschlichem Wort, göttlichen und menschlichen Bestandteilen usw.) Aber wir müssen von ihnen verlangen, daß sie Christum als das alleinige Heil verkündigen, als den, in dem Gott Fleisch geworden, der uns durch seinen sühnenden Tod erlöst und durch seine Auferstehung teilhaftig macht an dem unvergänglichen Leben.

Es ist wahr, daß es bei alle dem auf das **Leben** ankommt, aber das Leben fließt nach der Schrift aus dem Glauben, dem Glauben an den Erlöser. Es ist zuzugeben, daß man den Geist

Christi haben muß, um in Wahrheit ein Christ zu sein. Aber der Geist wurde denen gegeben, die an die Erhöhung des Gekreuzigten glaubten. Sollte es heute anders sein?

Es mag sein, daß ein Prediger mit einem Manko in der Lehre ein besserer Christ ist als der, der an den Fundamenten festhält. Wir haben niemand zu richten, aber wir haben das Evangelium zu verkündigen, das die Apostel gebracht haben. Wir wissen, wie nachdrücklich Paulus 1. Kor. 15 und an andern Orten das alte Evangelium gegen moderne Abschwächungen verteidigt. Müssen wir nicht heute mit derselben Festigkeit und Gewißheit es der Welt als den Grund dartun, auf dem unser Glaube ruht?

„Die Lehrer werden leuchten wie des Himmels Glanz."

Diese herrliche Verheißung aus Daniel dürfen wir auch auf die Sontagsschullehrer anwenden. Moody erzählt in seinen „Anecdotes and Illustrations" (Seite 24), wie ein Sonntagsschullehrer auf sein Leben einen entscheidenden Einfluß gehabt habe. Derselbe habe ein Lungenleiden gehabt und sei im Begriff gewesen, von Chicago nach dem Osten zu reisen, um dort in seiner Heimat zu sterben. Vorher habe er aber die Schülerinnen seiner Klasse alle besucht und jede einzelne zum Glauben führen können. Moody begleitete ihn, und der Eindruck der gottgesegneten Seelenarbeit dieses Mannes habe ihn aus dem Geschäftsleben herausgerissen und ihn zum Evangelisten gemacht. Nie habe er diese Wahl bereut. „O," sagt er, „die Wonne, jemanden aus der Finsternis dieser Welt in die herrliche Freiheit der Kinder Gottes zu führen!" Man lese diese Episode in jenem Büchlein. Man mag sagen: methodistisch! Aber man denke an das nachfolgende Leben des großen Seelenführers, und man wird sagen, bei den Mädchen mag der Eindruck nicht nachhaltend gewesen sein, bei Moody reichte er in Zeit und Ewigkeit. Nächst Gott verdankt die Welt jenem Sonntagsschullehrer die Segensströme der Arbeit eines Moody.

Freilich, wenn wir nun an die Sonntagschullehrer von heute denken, so sehen wir den starken Kontrast. Es fehlt ihnen nicht nur vielfach Ausbildung und Fähigkeit, auch gerade der tiefe Ernst und das christliche Seelenleben des oben erwähnten Mannes. Männer sind so wie so selten im Lehrermaterial, und die Mädchen, die die Arbeit verrichten, scheinen nur selten das Begehren zu haben, „viele zur Gerechtigkeit zu weisen" (Dan. 12, 3). Es soll gewiß nicht geleugnet werden, daß vieles besser geworden ist. Sommerschulen und Lehrerausbildungskurse haben die Lehrtüchtigkeit vieler gehoben. Auch darf man annehmen, daß die, welche an jenen Kursen teilnehmen, meist innerlich ebenfalls geförderter

sind als der Durchschnitt und sicherlich die Pflege des Innenlebens ihrer Schüler wenigstens versuchen.

Im ganzen aber wird es so sein, daß die meisten Kinder ihrer Zeit sind und sich nur wenig über die Oberflächlichkeit und den Weltsinn des Durchschnitts erheben.

Dazu kommen noch allerhand andre Schwierigkeiten. Die Auswahl der Lektionen seitens des allgemeinen Lektionskomitees ist oft eine sehr unglückliche. Die „gleichförmigen" Lektionskurse führen uns in vier Jahren durch die Bibel. In dem Bestreben, möglichst alle Teile der Bibel zu benutzen, bieten sie viele Lektionen, die für die jüngeren Klassen unbrauchbar sind. Das war besonders in prophetischen Abschnitten der letzten zwei Quartale bemerkbar.

Besondre Hindernisse sind in den älteren Knabenklassen zu überwinden. Ein Beispiel. Wir suchten kürzlich einen Lehrer für eine solche Klasse. Sie hatten in den letzten Jahren drei Lehrer gehabt. Zwei waren Graduierte von Colleges. Der letzte war nie über die „Grammar Classes" hinausgekommen. Dennoch behaupteten die Knaben, daß dieser letzte ihr bester Lehrer gewesen sei. Warum? Nicht weil er natürliche Lehrgaben besessen, sondern weil er mehr auf die Probleme des täglichen Lebens eingegangen sei. Wahrscheinlich ging ihm in Folge der mangelnden Ausbildung der Stoff bald aus, und er half sich dann, indem er so gut als möglich ins Leben hineingriff. Natürlich ist es nötig, durchaus nötig, daß der Lehrer den Zusammenhang mit dem Leben nicht verliere, aber er muß doch auch dem Bibeltext gerecht werden; sonst artet die Sonntagschularbeit in planlose Diskussionen aus, die wohl in etwa anregend sein mögen, die aber mit Religion nur wenig zu tun haben.

Es erfordert großes Geschick, zwischen Textauslegung und Anwendung die rechte Mitte zu halten. Jedoch Bibelkunde ist nötig. Die Uebersichten („reviews"), die wir am Schluß eines Quartals vornehmen, offenbaren stets eine erstaunliche Unwissenheit in der Kenntnis der Charaktere und Lebensschicksale der Männer der Bibel. Wie können die Schüler der Predigt in der Kirche mit Nutzen folgen, wenn sie die Anspielungen des Predigers an bekannte Tatsachen in der Bibel gar nicht einmal verstehen?

Wir sehen uns alle Zeit umhindert von den größten Schwierigkeiten, wenn es gilt, für reifere Klassen Lehrer zu finden, die ihrer Aufgabe gewachsen sind. Es wäre auch leicht, auf noch andre Steine im Weg zu weisen, so daß ein Bild entstände, das alles andre als ermutigend sein würde.

The Christian World

What Is Humanism? Here Are Some Answers

A new school of thought called "Humanism" has arisen in the Unitarian fellowship—new to our denomination, but very old in the history of philosophy. Naturally, it has caused a good deal of questioning. What is humanism?

In a volume of "Humanist Sermons," edited by Curtis W. Reese, eighteen humanist ministers have attempted to answer this question. Some of the answers are fairly clear and comprehensible. Others are vague and inchoate. All of them seem to lack definiteness of statement about the fundamental questions of religion. The humanists talk much of religion. The humanists talk much about such things as "the supreme worth of life, and the necessity of treating it as an end and not as a means;" the attempt to understand human experience by means of human inquiry; and "the effort to enrich human experience to the utmost capacity of man and the utmost limits of environing conditions"—things which Unitarians have always accepted as the working principles of their faith. But what do the humanists think about God; and the relation of the soul to a Higher Power; and its need of communion with that Power; and its hope of coming into more harmonious relations with that Power, in this life and in a life beyond death?

Most of the dissertations on humanism do not give satisfactory answers to these questions. But occasionally a humanist states the humanistic position in plain terms. In the May, 1928, number of the *Humanist*, published by the Unitarian Society of Holywood, Calif., Russell W. Peterson, speaking for the humanists, in an article on "Theism," says: "The humanist . . . discards theism as distracting and unnecessary"—which means that he discards his belief in God.

That states the humanistic position very clearly. When humanism discards theism, it has to go to the opposite position—atheism, because there is nowhere else to go. Mr. Peterson seems to realize this. He closes his criticism of theism with these words: "Son of man . . . know theyself. For thou alone art God." In his thought man is the only God there is in the universe. He is frankly atheistic.

In the same issue of the *Humanist*, its editor, the Rev. Theodore Curtis Abel, says: "The humanist has thought his way through theism and left it far behind . . . one can be a humanist only in proportion as he outgrows his theism"—which means that one can not be a humanist until one has discarded one's belief in God. This again states the humanistic position very clearly. As Mr. Abel puts it, a man has to become an atheist in order to be a humanist. We use the word simply as a term of classification, and with no thought of casting opprobrium on any one. We are simply letting the humanists tell

us in their own words what humanism is; and we gain nothing by refusing to call a spade a spade.

In the *Register* of July 19, the report of an address by the Rev. E. Burdette Backus, at Star Island, reads as follows: "Mr. Backus attempted to show how a man may be truly religious without belief in a personal God. He pointed out the elements of worship which may be retained by the man who has discarded the idea of God as personal, conscious, intelligent, and guiding the universe." The report of the same address in the *Boston Transcript* of July 18, under the heading, "Religion without God," says: "In his own view, which excludes a personal God, the values for human life which have inhered in the God conception are not lost, said Mr. Backus. It is a mistake to believe that a humanitarian program can not be carried forward without a belief in God." Mr. Backus, speaking as a humanist, frankly takes the atheistic position.

In the *Register* of July 19, Dr. A. Wakefield Slaten, in an address entitled, "The Unfinished Symphony and the Director," says: "Lest I should be misunderstood . . . let me remark that what I have said is not to be construed as a confession of theism." In that one sentence Dr. Slaten frankly takes the atheistic position.

In the *Register* of June 7, Dr. Horace Westwood, who is not a humanist, gives this estimate of humanism: "Humanists are concerned with . . . the persuasion of men that in the last analysis the problem of man's future is one of human responsibility, and hence to the building of a Human Providence which shall function in every sphere of human activity." If we understand Dr. Westwood, he says that humanism is an attempt to persuade men to build a Human Providence which shall take the place of the theist's concept of God. This confirms the testimony of the humanists themselves, that humanism has rejected the God idea of theism and is occupying the atheistic position.

In the *Register* of June 28, Rev. Henry W. Pinkham, speaking for the humanists, says: "If we find that as a matter of fact our greatest blessings proceed from human wisdom and goodness rather than from any alleged supernatural personal agency we have been taught to call God, then human wisdom and goodness will have to us the value of God." This statement is in exact line with Dr. Westwood's statement that humanism seeks to build a Human Providence which shall take the place of the God concept of theism.

These citations are sufficient to show that humanism has abandoned the theistic position and is occupying the atheistic position. Such testimonies of leading humanists justify us in saying that humanism and atheism come very close to being synonymous terms. If any one is calling himself a humanist under the impression that humanism is not atheism, I venture to assert that he does not understand humanism. It follows naturally that when humanism discards belief in God, the correlative beliefs in prayer and the soul and immortality have little meaning and soon die of inanition. There is no logical place for them in the humanistic program.

Now when a religious movement asks us to accept a program of atheism as something far superior to theism, it ought to have impregnable scientific ground upon which to base its appeal. Has humanism such ground? Science furnishes no evidence of it. The humanists talk much about applying the scientific method to religious thought. We all agree that religion should employ that method. But the application of the scientific method to religious thought is one thing, and the facts which science has established are another. What fact has science discovered that makes the theistic position untenable and the humanistic position the true one?

What does science know about the cause or the constitution of the universe? Absolutely nothing. And no reputable scientist makes any claim that it does. Scientists have advanced many theories; but here, again, scientific speculation is one thing and scientific findings are another. Science doesn't know what life is, or force, or matter. It doesn't yet know the nature of the atom. It has advanced a half dozen theories about it in the past thirty years, and has had to abandon them all. It doesn't know whethere there is a God—whether the force that runs the universe is intelligent or unintelligent, conscious or unconscious, personal or impersonal. It doesn't know whether man has a soul, or is a soul occupying a body; whether man lives after death, or ceases to live when death occurs. In fact, science knows so little about the fundamental questions with which religion has to deal that it can not be regarded as an authority on these questions. It is profoundly ignorant about the things that most vitally concern our faith and hope.

And yet the humanists, professing to base their religious thinking on the findings of science, discard theism and ask us to accept a program of socialistic atheism as the solution of all our religious and social problems. Isn't it possible that our humanistic friends have been listening more to the theorizing of a certain school of materialistic pseudo-scientists than to the voice of the living God, bearing testimony in their own souls to the abiding realities of the spiritual realm?

And how is this movement going to affect our denomination? We have been inviting humanist speakers to deliver addresses on humanism at our conferences and before our young people. We have voted in convention to publish hymns and prayers and services with God left out of them, for the use of the humanists. We have proposed to conduct special missions in humanist churches. Does all this mean that, as a denomination, we are going to accept the humanist program and take our stand before the world as a body of atheists, whose only gospel is ethical culture and social service?

I feel that I must make my own position perfectly clear in this matter. I do not believe that rejection of the God idea is an advance in religion. To the contrary, I believe that it is a retreat that will ultimately destroy our influence and usefulness as a fellowship of free churches. I do not believe that Unitarians can go before the world with a program of atheism, no matter how many shibboleths of ethical culture and social service they may couple with it, and win the

confidence and allegiance of people who care enough about religion to support churches of any kind. As I see it, religion without God is religion without meaning and motive-power, and if we undertake to sponsor such a religion, it will be the beginning of the end ofr us. I am firmly convinced that no religious body can discard its belief in God and continue to live, much less feed the spiritual hunger of people.

I am therefore unalterably opposed to humanism, in any of its guises or disguises. If religious liberty as we know and highly prize it in our free churches leads to atheism, and the discarding of the things that keep the faith and hope of the world alive, then we must admit that the more conservative bodies of Protestantism are fully justified in their persistent distrust of it.—*The Christian Register.*

Channing and Dr. Fosdick

John Clarence Petrie

It is a commonplace among Liberals today that were the Congregationalists of a century ago of the theological mind that they are now the Unitarian schism would not have occurred; but what is not always so easily recognized is that as great an evolution in theological thought has taken place among certain Anglicans, Methodists, Disciples, and Baptists as among the liberal Congregationalists. The type of life of Christ that has come in recent years from Baptists like Shirley Jackson Case, and from Methodists like Walter Bundy, and the sort of theology that emanates from such Disciples as Dr. Ames of the University of Chicago, are sufficient proofs to those who keep abreast of religious thought that the Unitarian schism was caused over theories that are today not only commonplace but indeed sometimes looked upon as a bit conservative.

The Unitarian may well hesitate to say that Unitarianism has become the prevailing theology among advanced Christian thinkers, for the simple reason, if for no other, that it sounds like blowing his own horn.

There is a great temptation for Unitarians to ask indignantly why, if these men are Unitarians, do they not join the Unitarian Church? But we must have patience. It is only within the past quarter century that thinkers in the Orthodox denominations have dared speak out frankly. The movement has not yet become articulate among the people. It is very much to be doubted if many of the great preachers could take the majority of their congregations with them if they decided they must change denominational affiliations. And the ferment is such that it may pay to watch what will happen denominationally in a rather short time. There can be no doubt that the theological cleavages among Christians of the same churches are becoming too wide for a permanent maintaining of the present lines. Dr. Fosdick himself is authority for the statement, "It is not that the United Liberal Church will not come, but that it may come too soon." Be this as it may, there must be considerable interest for Unitarians in the growth of Unitarian thought in churches that up till recently have been inclined to stigmatize Unitarianism as a lifeless heresy.

It is probably not at all an exaggeration to name Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick as America's most popular preacher and writer on religious subjects. His little triology, "The Meaning of Faith," "The Meaning of Prayer," "The Meaning of Service," has sold by the hundred thousand, while other books of his are scarcely less popular. Seats are always at a premium wherever he speaks; and his radio sermons probably find more listeners than those of any other. And when Dr. Fosdick writes for all the world to read on the subject of Christianity and so describes that religion in its essence as to agree with the thought of the founder of American Unitarianism, it is impossible for us not to take notice.

Let there be no mistakes about it: Dr. Fosdick's essay in the April *Harper's* on "What Is Christianity?" finds him placing at the heart and center of Christianity exactly what Channing saw.

But first as to Dr. Fosdick's method. It is delightfully disarming to the prejudices of the less bold Christian. After a brief introduction in which he points out that after all there must be something distinctive about Christianity as compared with Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, and other world faiths, he proceeds to point out some of the features held by Christians which, common opinion to the contrary notwithstanding, are really not distinctive of Christianity at all. Is the inspired Book distinctive? Surely one brought up on the theories of the sixteenth century would think so; but Dr. Fosdick shows that other religions have Bibles and treat them about as Christians do theirs. Is it miracles? But miracles are not the private property of Christians, for all religions claim their founders were wonder workers. Is it the deity of Christ? This too is not of the essence of Christianity—and here the Unitarian accustomed to being outlawed for his denial of this so-called keystone of the Christian arch must gasp for breath—for there are deifications and virgin births in the other great religions of mankind. Is it the Second Coming—not even here is Christianity distinctive, for Zoroastrians, Mohammedans, and Buddhists look for a second appearance of their prophets. Not salvation by faith in the truth of certain creedal statements is essential—no, nor the living of a life of love and philanthropy.

This, I take it, betrays the magnificent knoweldge of human psychology of this popular preacher. There is no question in my mind but that Dr. Fosdick believes none of the above doctrines, and it is because he does not come out flat-footed and say so that he is given up in despair by so many Unitarians. "Why this beating about the bush?" they ask in impatience. I make no attempt to justify the methods of this preacher, nor to judge him or his critics. What I do wish to point out is this, that the inescapable effect of his method of dealing with the non-essentials that have grown up in Christian theology is to show that they *are* non-essentials and therefore not necessary of acceptance. This must be a sad blow to those who consider those doctrines of the essence of Christianity, but it must come like a proclamation of emancipation to those thousands who have been trying to live Christian lives and yet have had to suffer daily conflict be-

cause of the unbelievable doctrines which they have thought a necessary part of their religion. Most of the followers of Dr. Fosdick do not want to have to believe what looks to them like superstition. Instead of trying to prove a negative, that is, instead of trying to absolutely prove the falsity of these beliefs, he has merely shown their unimportance. He has done over again the work that was accomplished eighty years ago for Unitarianism by Theodore Parker—he has pointed out that there is a permanent and a transient in Christianity.

From impaling the non-essentials he goes on to the essentials, and here we Unitarians must rejoice to find stated over again the root principle in the theology of William Ellery Channing. "The genius of Christianity," writes this modern liberal Baptist, "lies in reverence for personality." Jesus "was an historic personality and he made a concrete and describable contribution to human thought. He was the champion of human personality. He laid hold on that, lifted it up, conceived it in all its appearances in child, woman, peasant, or king as infinitely valuable. Moreover, he thought of personality as the central fact in the universe and used it as the medium for the interpretation for all other facts." And he goes on to say that the great fight which Christianity will have to make in the near future will be whether or not we can "maintain Jesus' attitude toward personality. The answer to that question is the sign of a falling or rising Christianity." Appearances may be against the importance of human personality, but "take it or leave it, that is what Christianity is about."

Now leaving aside the different circumstances under which it grew and to which it had to be applied, this doctrine is Christianity exactly as Channing saw it. The very center of his religion was a belief in the divine image in man. Channing's doctrine of the divinity of man and all that flowed from it is Fosdick's reverence for personality. And as in Dr. Fosdick today, so in Channing a century ago, the result was a tremendous accent upon the social implications. To Channing there was a great social evil in America, an evil because it took the souls of black men and so smirched them that the divine image within had no chance of shining forth. Slavery was the great American crime against human personality, and against it Channing smote with all the power at his command. Following him was the whole school of New England Unitarianism, Emerson, Parker, and the rest. In the sermons and writings of Dr. Fosdick we see the same applications of the same principle to the changed conditions of today. Our great social evils today are war, industrial injustice, crime, and poverty. Against them Dr. Fosdick lashes out with all the vigor that the Unitarian fathers displayed in the fight on human slavery. And, like Dr. Fosdick, Channing spent remarkably little time in theological controversy and denominational apologetics. "I indeed," said Channing, "belong to that class of Christians who are distinguished by believing that there is one God, even the Father, and that Jesus Christ is not this one God, but his dependent and obedient Son. But my accordance with these is far from universal, nor have I any desire to extend it. . . ."

I wish to regard myself as belonging not to a sect, but to the community of free minds, of lovers of truth, of followers of Christ." And in the sermon on "The Great Purpose of Christianity" from which I have quoted the above words, he goes on to say that Christ came "not to be an outward but an inward deliverer; not to rear an outward throne, but to establish a kingdom within us. . . to join us to God—by likeness of nature, by participation of his spirit."

"We are too apt," continued Channing, "to look abroad for good. But the only true good is within. In this outward universe, magnificent as it is, in the bright day and the starry night, in the earth and skies we can discover nothing so vast as thought, so strong as the unconquerable purpose of duty, so sublime as the spirit of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice. A mind which withstands all the powers of the outward universe, all the pains which fire and sword and storm can inflict, rather than swerve from uprightness, is nobler than the universe. Why will we not learn the glory of the soul? . . . We all possess within us what is of more worth than the external creation."

What distinction is there between Dr. Fosdick's doctrine that the essence of Christianity lies in reverence for personality and the teaching of Channing that the soul is worth more than the whole universe? Indeed Channing says in so many words, "His (Christ's) great distinction consists in the grandeur and beneficence of his influence on the soul." The purpose of worship in Channing's mind was not to flatter God nor to obtain gifts from Him, but that we might become like Him whose attributes we worship—we worship God that we may become godlike. Human personality is the gainer if we worship the infinite and strive to become like it. And, like Dr. Fosdick, Channing attributed personality to God because of the personality of man. If man is made in God's image then God is a person, not a blind force, for even human personality is superior to the external universe—*a fortiori* must the Deity be superior to humanity.

Sectarian pride may be flattered by the discovery that America's most popular preacher is teaching principles that Unitarianism was maintaining a hundred years ago. But with Dr. Fosdick we must admit that the divinity of man, the sacredness of human personality, is not to be mathematically demonstrated. We can take small credit to ourselves for the depth of insight of a Channing or a Parker if we ourselves are facing defeat in our own thinking about the dignity of our human nature. If Channing was right that the task of true Christianity is to awaken in men the realization of their kinship with the divine and to urge the mto so burnish the image within that it may shine forth and give proofs of the existence of Deity, then we may not rest on the laurels won by our fathers. The doctrine of the sacredness of personality is not really a doctrine at all but a hypothesis—something to be acted upon by real living *as if*. If the fruits of mere mechanical materialism are as great as those which proceed from the doctrine of the divinity of the soul, there is no argument that can keep that doctrine longer alive. Our task today, as will be the task

of religion always, is the redemption of the soul of man. As a church it is our task to urge men to treat their own bodies and the bodies of other *as if* they were the receptacles of divinity—not merely to say with their lips that they believe it.

To quote Channing again: "Expect no good from Christ any farther than you are exalted by his character and teaching." "The human soul is his kingdom . . . . His noblest monument is a soul redeemed from iniquity. . . . No other monument does Christ desire; for this will endure when earthly thrones shall have fallen, and even when the present order of the outward universe shall have accomplished its work and shall have passed away."

Christian Leader (Universalist)

Preaching in British Pulpits *

HOWARD A. VERNON

To be transferred from the quiet of Minneapolis, almost village like in its atmosphere, to the roaring life of old London town, and knowing that I was there to preach in British pulpits, was in every sense a new experience. The thrill of it will remain the memory of a lifetime. Passing from Minneapolis to London is like going from noisy youth to quiet middle age. Minneapolis is a young city; London is old. Minneapolis is spacious and graceful; London with its monotonous and melancholy houses, built compactly together, is like a huge patchwork, pieced together without design.

To put down in brief statement one's impression of London is not easy. London is like an immense vortex into which innumerable lives are ceaselessly drawn. Endless streams of men and women surge up and down its winding thoroughfares. The smoke from a thousand factories and a million chimney-pots hangs like a somber pall over the huge monster. Day and night the ceaseless roar of its life goes on—the roll of myriad omnibuses; the rattle of underground trains; the murmur of its eight million voices, harshly or tenderly speaking, madly or mockingly laughing; the roar of its machinery; the endless tramp, tramp, tramp of innumerable feet about the hard pavements. London seemed a kind of symbol of the crisis that civilization must meet today. Beneath all of its surface sounds I seemed to hear the sad, sobbing music of the world—a kind of composite tone, in which were the strident notes of evil laughter, the faint echo of tender sighs, the deep undertone of measureless yearning, the wild note of joy and love. In a word, I seemed to hear the voice of humanity.

But if London is alluring, England and Scotland are even more so. Hedgerows and hawthorns, sloping hills and silvery lakes, herds of sheep grazing amid the heather, quaint old half-timbered, gabled houses—all make up a scene one can not easily forget. Rural England is supremely beautiful in the vivid green of its summer dress, a place of sacred memories—sad and tragic memories, too, many of them, and yet brightened through the centuries by the mellow light of learning or by great examples of self-giving devotion and heroic endurance.

Having been asked by the Council on Interchange between British and American Preachers to speak in British pulpits this past summer, I accepted the invitation as a privilege and a pleasure, and a little later in the spring came my preaching itinerary. I found myself booked for five churches: one in Glasgow, one in Norwich, one in Burnley, and two in London—Congregational churches all save the one in Glasgow; the latter being the old Renfield United Free Church.

My Sunday in Glasgow will serve as a typical illustration of the four succeeding Sundays in various parts of England. The charm of Scotland rests not alone on its scenic beauty, but in the wholesome and rugged character of its people. The influence of religion, as voiced in Scottish Presbyterianism, has left deep marks upon the life of Scotland. The thunder of John Knox's voice is still a living thing. Glasgow is an industrial city. The roar of its machinery mingles with the soft flow of the Clyde. It lacks the academic atmosphere of Edinburgh. It spreads out in a sprawling confusion, flat and black beneath the smoke of its factories. Here too are great churches made famous by illustrious preachers of other days. James Stalker once preached in Glasgow; Alexander Whyte was at one time an influential figure there; and Marcus Dods once thundered from the pulpit of Renfield Church.

Knowing that Renfield was to be my field of action for a Sunday, I made a preliminary skirmish on Saturday afternoon and so got the lay of the land. Renfield is situated in the heart of the city, an imposing structure seating about 1,500 people. Even in the heat of the summer it affords an unusual opportunity as a preaching center.

Knocking at the church office, I was met by the old verger, a genial Scotchman with a rich brogue. He took me back into the vestry, through the Sunday school rooms, and then out into the spacious auditorium with its great organ, its high pulpit, and its gallery running around three sides of the building. The quaint old cushioned pews were equipped with a desk-like arrangement in front, on which were placed the books for the time of worship. On each desk were copies of the Bible, the paraphrased psalm-book, and the hymnary—a wise provision, surely, for how can they sing without hymnals; how can they read without Bibles; how can they follow the psalm without psalm-books? Every provision is made for a rich and complete service.

On Sunday morning I made my way to the vestry and donned the preacher's gown. The old verger, attired in full dress suit, gave me the order of the day together with the "intimations" for the service. These "intimations," I learned upon inquiry, were the usual announcements for the week. Five minutes before the hour of worship the verger went out of the vestry reverently carrying in his arms the great pulpit Bible, the psalm-book, and the hymnal. He climbed slowly the narrow flight of steps to the circular box-pulpit and laid the books upon the sacred desk. How swift was the come and go of variant emotions as, a few moments later, I climbed those pulpit stairs, followed by the old verger, who closed the pulpit door and so left me with literally a "shut-in" feeling.

How they go to church in Scotland! There were perhaps a thousand people present that morning, aged saints, many of them; weather-beaten, too, some of them; in the eyes a serious light, a kind of tender light, albeit you were conscious as you looked at them that time had not dissolved the iron out of their faith.

Approaching the church on Sunday evening, fifteen minutes before the hour of worship, I was startled to see a huge sign in front of the doors: "Church crowded—No more admitted." The doors were closed and locked. I climbed the pulpit stairs that evening to look out on a sea of faces. Every available space was taken. People were sitting on the pulpit stairs, on the platform below me, and they were standing at the back, both in the gallery and on the ground floor. And this on a hot summer Sunday evening!

American church services are characterized by irreverent hurry. The service must be "snappy." People pull their watches on you the moment you begin to preach, and you feel that you are racing for time, and when you have been going at breakneck speed for fifteen minutes, they pull their watches again, and look up at you with startled expression, as if to say, "Man alive, *do* you know what time it is?" We hurry through the hymns, omitting the third and fourth verses; we read brief portions of scripture; and the sermon is the only commodity on the market in which we demand short measure.

Not so in Scotland. The service is lengthy; there are six hymns, two scripture lessons, three prayers, a chant by the choir and an anthem, and always a children's talk, and then the sermon. And when the last "amen" is spoken there is no unseemly rush for wraps and hats, as if they were trying to catch a steamer for Europe, and no other steamer were going for six months—no, they they sit again, after the benediction, with bowed heads, in absolute silence, waiting to catch the accents of His stillness.

"We stand to bless thee e'er our worship cease,
Then, lowly kneeling, wait thy word of peace."

The inspiration of that preaching experience will abide like a fragrant memory as long as I live. The service was rich in inspiration largely because the people gave such splendid co-operation. When you announced the hymns, they sang; when you prayed, they prayed; when you read your morning lessons, they followed the reading with open Bibles; when you announced the offering, they gave; when you preached, they listened with heart and mind. To preach in such a church is a memorable experience alike for its uplift of soul and for its challenge to the intellect.

In England similar Sundays followed. Never before have I preached to such large audiences in the summer season. Sunday in England is, of course, no longer the "silent Sunday" of which Thomas Carlyle wrote when he said, "The beer shops are closed while the respectabilities go through the mummeries of the rubric which is a greater feat than beer." But people do go to church in England, I think in larger numbers than here. Such at any rate was my own experience, not only in Glasgow but in London and many other places.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)
NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*

Adventure. The Faith of Science and the Science of Faith by *B. U. Streeter, Cath. M. Chilcott, John Macmurray, Alex S. Russell.* The Macmillan Co., New York, 1928. 247 p.

The book contains a number of contributions by scientists and theologians on the relation between religion and science. Their general attitude is that there is no irreconcilable conflict between the two but that we may look for a period in which they will be regarded as two diverse, but intrinsically connected, adventures of the spirit of man. The title, "Adventure," given the book, if rather vague, seems to express the confident hope of the writers that those who push off boldly from the mainland of traditional Christianity may perhaps make discoveries beyond their fondest dreams.

Faith and knowledge have always been supposed to belong to two different fields. Knowledge is the result of scientific research, but where science can no longer lead us, there faith takes us by the hand. While it gives us no certainty it establishes probability. Such faith is identified with intuition or spiritual experience, or rests possibly only on outward authority. The author of the second essay, "Beyond Knowledge" (Mr. John Macmurray) rejects this whole idea of the scientist and the religious thinker belonging to different worlds. According to him science needs faith as much as does religion. Science rests on the conviction that there is no certain (ultimate) knowledge. All knowledge is more or less well-grounded belief. All beliefs, without exception, must be tested before they can be accepted. This testing is done by experiment. Experiment, however, is only possible on the basis of the belief which it tests and helps to reshape. Science, therefore, starts, not from facts, but from beliefs. Science consists precisely in the continuous and deliberate remaking of beliefs which are found to be faulty.

It is the same in the domains of religion. Faith, which is so much made of in the bible, is not the holding of certain beliefs, it is an attitude of the mind which produces practical achievement. The presence of evil e. g. is to the Christian a challenge to cooperate in the establishment of a better order, the "Kingdom of God." Science and Christianity alike ground knowledge upon activity, and in doing so, preach the life of faith. In the intellectual field, the terms "scientific" and "Christian," properly understood, are synonymous.

This seems a rather unusual way of putting it to the reader. The author doubtless means that the Christian is, or ought to be, a truth-seeker. He seeks truth by acting on the faith he has and by giving it

a practical test finds it either vindicated or modified. Thus his purpose and method of procedure are the same as the scientist's.

Streeter then has a rather large chapter, "Moral Adventure," in which he gives his views on the Ethics of Sex (on marriage, divorce, prostitution).

In "Finality in Religion" Streeter again discusses the objections to the claims made for Christ, and by him, that he was God made man. Could the infinite be expressed in the finite? and could the climax of human development have been reached by Christ 1900 years ago? Since religion is concerned, he says, with the qualitative aspect of Reality (see his book, "Reality," and our discussion of it in the May number 1929, pp. 232 ff.), it had to have recourse to methods akin to those of Art. If God *is* Love, then the story of the Cross brings this home to us in a way that no conceptual language can. Abstract terms could not convey as much of truth as can a concrete picture.

To the evolutionist Streeter tries to make Christ's character and influence reasonable by classing him as a man of genius and the time in which he lived as the classical epoch of religion. The occurrence of genius cannot be explained, but a favorable environment is necessary for its development. Will Jesus ever be surpassed? An idle question. Live on the highest level you know and leave it to the future to decide whether it is final or only a stage to something so much better as to be at present unimaginable by man.

In the last two chapters, "Objectivity in Religion" and "Myth and Reality" the historicity of the Christian tradition is the subject of investigation. The view is expressed by many that if Christianity reveals the truth it is comparatively unimportant whether Christ was a historic person and his life the same as portrayed in the gospels. His story might be a myth and yet it might be a source of inspiration to higher living. The writers agree that the life of Christ was a "mythos" in the sense that it developed in a series of acts that had symbolical meaning, but not in the sense that it was a fabrication of the myth-making mind of the age. It really happened as it is described. Christ was the incarnation of the deity. He became the mediator between God and man and he overcame sin by suffering and sacrifice. And even as the divine became incarnate in him so it does in the Christian individual; the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the expression of the fact that the mind of Christ has power to become the creative principle in other lives.

It stands to reason that if this whole story about Jesus was a fairy tale only, the bottom of reality would fall out of the Christian faith. We might still have the bare idea that there is a God who is interested in the human race, but we should have for this belief nothing higher or more authoritative than the faith of some obscure men in the first century, who had literary genius enough to give their tale the ring of reality.

The fact that God was really incarnate in Christ cannot be demonstrated, but it can be made reasonable. It is generally conceded that Christ's teaching about God has never been surpassed. His life and

character, at the same time, are such as to be in accord with his high teaching. He never has any sense of personal unworthiness, his communion with the father is never broken. Historically it can also be stated that the whole civilization that came after him was in a large degree the product of his influence. In addition, there is no other claimant for the place of highest excellence. The impact of Christ's personality tends towards the unification of the spiritual life, the gathering into one force of the disunions of art and science, philosophy and practice, individual and social activities towards the mitigation of one-sidedness and prejudice, towards balance and sanity. "The wind of agreement carries us to the acceptance of a hypothesis, not a dogma: that if we are to make religion real we must assume an incarnation of God in a human personality. Religion becomes for us the life of faith, the ceaseless infinite testing of our hypothesis in all fields of human activity. This is our call to faith, to our adventure which by the continuity of a secular experiment is ever strengthening its claims to truth. For a faith that glories in its subjectivity glories in its shame. It is a cowardice and an egoism."

It is evident that the conception of faith here discussed is different from the one we hold. To the authors faith is an assumption we make of an hypothesis based on traditional belief. This assumption we feel ought to be tested because no one has already all knowledge. By testing we verify whatever is of truth in the hypothesis and cast off the error and limitation. The scriptural faith, however, is not the assumption of an hypothesis, but confident trust in Christ and redemption in him. Reviewer confesses to the view of religion—rejected by the writers—which makes it an intuitive conviction of the individual, admitting of no scientific proofs and needing none, but is standing on its own broad base as a distinctive human experience and contributing to personality, as art does, an insight and wisdom of its own. But we by no means admit that this view destroys the objectivity of religion. It was the view held by the first Christians, see Hebrews XI, it was the view of the Reformers, and the one held by the "father of the modern theology" (Schleiermacher). It requires no scientific proof to enable it to stand on its feet, but its reasonablenss can be shown just as well—and we think better—than is done in this book, which makes faith a science and science a faith.

The Way of Modernism and other Essays, by *J. F. Bethune Baker*, Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. The University Press, Cambridge, 1927. 150 pages.

Modernism in the Protestant church, is the attempt to bring the Christian faith in harmony with present day science. In order to bring this about a great many reductions in the traditional views of Christianity are required. A different attitude to the bible and to the creeds of the church is one of the natural results. Some modernists go far in rejecting beliefs held to be vital by the orthodox; they offer new creeds in place of the old and antiquated ones. Not so the writer

of these essays. He is not of the opinion that ours is a creed-making age. He is in favor of retaining the old ones, but giving them new meanings. It must be our privilege, he says, to interpret them in keeping with our modern view of the world and life, as described by science; for we cannot be expected to sacrifice our intellectual integrity. At the same time, we retain the old terms and creeds because we feel they were the true expression of the men and age that produced them. We are the spiritual children of those ancestors; we have added new knowledge to the old faith but in spirit, in the way of life, we are the same.

The new light given to our age finds, in the opinion of the author, its focus in the *evolutionary theory.* To him it is not a theory any more; it is an established fact like the law of gravitation. He speaks of it and of its influence on his general attitude in exaggerated terms. Two of the greatest revelations that have ever come to man about himself and the world to which he belongs are the Christian religion in the first century and the theory of evolution in the 19th (!) "In each case there was a central figure, an outstanding personality, in whom and with whom the experience began." The one is Jesus Christ, the other—the author doesn't say so but it is to be implied—is Chas. Darwin. Reviewer wonders how the writer could ever so lose his sense of proportion.

There are in the story of Jesus' life many facts (like the infancy stories, resurrection, ascension) which are not to be taken as literal happenings but have a symbolical value. They are expressions of what the first Christians thought about him. In the scriptures—and consequently in our Christian practise—there is a dualism between the natural and supernatural; there are miracles of healing, nature miracles. There is furthermore a whole drama of the conflict of evil powers with the world of man, beginning with the father of the race, running through all history, finding its climax in Jesus and ending in the triumphant era of the new heaven and earth. Evolution has done away with all this. There never was a golden age of man, no fall of man, no original sin. Man's history was always one of moral conflict. With the story of Adam and the fall of man goes the theology that was based on it.

The fundamental idea of the Christian faith is that of the *incarnation:* the Word, the "logos," became flesh. The logos means the reason, the divine reason. The meaning is that there is a divine purpose for man. The author of the 4th gospel finds the realization of that purpose in Jesus Christ. Evolution, showing the selective process which finally ended in the origin of man, can be said to be in harmony with scripture's chief idea. All the history of the world before man was a preparation for man. The best that had been achieved so far was used for the making of man. So then man was the goal towards which evolution was tending, and we can say that, on the level of man at least there is a *design* in the world process.

The readers will notice that the resemblance between the incarna-

tion (John 1: 14) and the idea that there is a purpose behind and a progress before man, is certainly very slight.

In the new theology that Modernism feels called upon to formulate the incarnation will be the cornerstone. The authority it relies upon is not the teachings of Jesus, for one reason because they are a disputed matter. Nor the theology of Paul: it contains many "vestigial survivals" of a pre-scientific stage. Evolution is to be our guide. Not the teachings of Jesus, we say, but the way he lived, the attitude towards God and man he maintained. His consciousness of God has never been surpassed, neither in vital strength nor in moral evolution. If we say Jesus is divine we mean he is the fullest revelation to us of God that was ever given. But Jesus did not only reveal God; he revealed man. Human values found in him their best and highest expression. There arises naturally the question, where did Jesus get the light, the strength, the uniqueness in insight and personality that were his? This question finds no adequate answer in the book. The writer says at one place: "Jesus is unique, but he is not God. Any saying or act of his could come from a man of his lineage and convictions—the convictions themselves being only 'unique' in degree."

According to this, heredity, environment and personal endowment would explain all of his personality and work. Bethune Baker is fully aware of the gulf between him and the traditional teaching of the church. But he doesn't think for a moment of withdrawing from her fellowship. Nor does he have to fear that the church will cast him out as a heretic. He knows that the Church of England has always been very tolerant of different types of theological thought. Should, then, he and men of his way of thinking try to get the church to create new formularies of faith? He is not in favor of this. Men today are interested in life and reality; for the business of putting the new light in adequate authoritative form they have neither talent nor mood. Let the old doctrines and articles stand and interpret them as science and experience enable you to make them appeal to the present age.

The author concludes by saying that Christian truth as "embodied in a tale" is not static, nor to be apprehended by intellectual effort, nor once seen to be understood. It is a living operative purpose, with which we must identify ourselves if we are to understand it. The one key is a continually enriching experience. "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine." At no point are we offered a final solution; at every point a call and a hope.

Mother India, by *Katherine Mayo.* New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1927. 440 pages, $3.25.

This is the most distressing and depressing book on India we have ever seen. With utter frankness the author discusses the real causes of India's terrible plight. After reading the initial chapters only, one gets so disgusted with the inhumanity of Indian customs that to read on becomes almost impossible. The things revealed are so revolting, so inhuman, so fiendish that they outrage every decent and normal feeling. Besides, the picture offered of Indian life is one of unrelieved

darkness. We have not found in the book a single aspect that might permit us to indulge in a smile, much less to cherish a hope in a better future.

The writer doubtless took no pleasure in painting such a heart-oppressing picture. She wanted to show the social conditions of India in all their naked ugliness and brutality in order to shock all friends of India into determined action for a radical reform. However, the evils are of such a glaring nature and they are so imbedded and entrenched in old traditions that a real material change seems to be out of the question. One feels, after reading the book, just like Isaiah, that "from the sole of the foot to the head no part is sound; nothing but bruises and gashes, and raw, bleeding wounds, unsqueezed, unbandaged, unsoftened with oil."

Miss Mayo is an American, under no obligation to the English government. In her opinion the British authorities do and have been doing all they could for the people. They have the best intentions to develop self-government in India. The people themselves are the real foes to their own advancement. Every step towards a modern solution of the gigantic abuses and malpractices of the land is checked by their superstition and enslavement to the past.

The rockbottom physical base of India's woes is, according to Miss Mayo, the *dominating position* given to the *sex-life*. A man's chief concern is to have a son, or a number of them, to care for his soul when he dies; and woman's only purpose in life is to bear this son. In this connection child-marriage, pregnancy, child-birth and the misery of the widows are described. Owing to the importance of the subject the writer goes very much into detail. The incidents she relates of the ill-treatment of women and, especially, the almost unbelievable tortures they suffer at the hands of ignorant midwives, form by far the darkest part of her story. It makes the reader's blood boil to hear of these things. Has the lot of anybody ever been as wretched as that of the women of India, and how long will it be until light shall fall into these haunts of ignorance and cruelty! The pathetic feature about it is that when educated husbands themselves insist on the employment of modern methods, doctors and hospitals for the succor of the women in travail, the older women of the household, rigid in their allegiance to the ignorant past, checkmate all these well-meant efforts. No wonder that the average death rate of women in childbirth as well as infant mortality in India is far in excess of any other country. Much has been said of the deplorable state of women in India, of child-marriage and of the hopeless lot of the widows—many of them children of tender age—but if Miss Mayo does not exaggerate, their lives are considerably worse than we ever imagined. The husband is to the wife her god on earth, she has no soul, she is barred from education. Only when she has born a man-child has she vindicated her right to be counted at all.

While the mistreatment of women and the unnatural stimulation of the sex-instinct are the most heinous evils of the country, there

is darkness enough and to spare wherever one looks. The caste system —a very invention of the devil one would call it—the tyranny of the brahman; the cow-worship and its disgusting by-products; the 50 million "untouchables"; the ignorance of and wholesale violation of all hygienic rules, even the most fundamental; the cruelties of the avaricious village owners, and ever so many other horrors—all these together, as presented in this book, make one feel that India is about the darkest and most hopeless spot in the universe.

Many friends of India—Mr. Ghandi above all—have asked, why, after so many years of English administration, are the people of India still so poor, so unenlightened, so enslaved? The answer, it seems to us, is not, because the English have kept them in bondage but because the Hindus themselves, their leaders and people, have blocked every forward step the government had undertaken. The 50 million untouchables are conscious of the fact that Indian self-government would fall on them with crushing force. When the Prince of Wales recently visited India and greeted the outcastes as though they were real men, the joy of these unfortunates knew no bounds. They have repeatedly asked the government not to fulfill the wishes of Brahman politicians because to do so would extinguish their only hope for a more humane future.

Miss Mayo does not discuss the religion of the Hindu people, except as far as it affects their life and social relations. But she does not conceal the awful truth that religion with the Indians is far more and oftener a bane than a blessing. All the evils of woman's degradation, of the caste institution, of their anti hygienic customs are founded on religious teachings and, therefore, all the harder to conquer.

The book is thoroughly pessimistic. It is often claimed that the Orient is more religious than the Occident; that Western nations are materialistic while the East cultivates the deep needs of the soul. There is a certain element of truth in it. However, the mysticism of the East is entirely unsocial; the seeker after God does nothing to relieve the sufferings of his poorer fellow-Indian. And the religion of the masses imposes on them a heavy burden, they derive from it no comfort and no moral uplift. Many of the Hindu temples are places of prostitution with phallic symbols and obscene pictures abounding.

Their only hope is Christianity, but only the outcastes are ready to embrace it. Mr. Gilkey gave us the impression as though India was on the point of turning to Christ. After reading this book, we believe that time is far distant as yet. The leading men of India want self-government most of all, to be as free from England as possible. If, instead, they tried to make their fellow-Indians see their awful plight and helped them to give up old vices, wrongs and superstitions, they would render them a greater service.

The book has created a sensation. In two years almost a dozen reprints were necessary. Hindu leaders naturally have resented the uncomplimentary handling of the many sore places of their national

life. They have said, if some Communist was to give a true description of conditions in capitalistic America (or Europe), the portrait would be equally hideous. We don't believe that. But even if it exposed ever so glaring faults we should accept it and our religion would be the very source from which we should draw insight and strength for conflict with those evils. The Indian has no such religious sources to fall back on. It is to be hoped that Miss Mayo's merciless diagnosis of India's ailments may convince all friends of India that only fundamental changes can bring real help.

Rightly Dividing the Word, by *J. Newton Davies,* Professor of N. T. Exegesis, Drew University. The Abingdon Press, 1929. 299 pages. $2.00.

Dr. Davies, born in Wales, in 1881, has been in this country, as a member of the faculty of Drew Theol. Seminary, since 1919. He is deeply impressed with the neglect of exegetical study in our seminaries and the effect of such neglect on the preaching of the pastors. While not considering expository preaching as the only way of presenting truth in the pulpit, he rightly claims that the great bible expositors of the past, such as Maclaren and Spurgeon, have rendered the church a service long remembered. A careful study of the bible text, made possible by a good acquaintance with the original Greek or Hebrew and the use of good commentaries, would be a priceless help to the "minister of the word." The book before us was written with that in mind. A careful exposition of some significant passages of the N. T. gives the reader an idea of how the rich meanings of the words of the bible may be coaxed to open their treasures to the student.

Such passages are: Phil 1: 9-11, Paul's prayer for the Philippian Church; 2 Cor. 6: 4-7, the Weapons of our Warfare; Phil. 3: 20, Pauline Metaphors for the Church; Pauline Designations for the Christians; the Great Invitation, and others.

The author makes a thorough analysis of each word, examining its O. T. past, its meaning in the Septuagint and the N. T. Koine; then going down the stream of time, pointing out what these words have accomplished in times of stress and peril, in the lives of the church's leaders. Illustrations of a practical nature abound and history and literature, with which the author is on good terms, are compelled to yield their tribute. One chapter is entitled: "Apollos: A Lukan Portrait." In it we get, on the basis of Acts 18: 24-28, a most attractive and decidedly interesting and reliable delineation of the "Chrysostom of the first century." One must read a chapter like this to get an impression of what a feast of spiritual banqueting is in store for the one who has this book on his study table.

It is hard today to be or to become an expository preacher. Charles Jefferson is the only one now who has made it a success. But to pay more attention to the Word and to be better able to make it fruitful for others, is an absolute necessity, and Dr. Davies can be of good value to him who seeks help in this field.

A Waking World. Christianity among the Non-White Races, by *Stanley High*. The Abingdon Press, 1928. 233 pages. Stanley High, now the editor of the "Christian Herald," (if our memory does not entirely mislead us) was sent out by the Board of Foreign Missions of the M. E. Church on a visit to Africa, India, Malaya and the Far East to study the missionary needs of those people on the ground. In this volume he presents the results of his observations. They are apt to shed considerable light on the missionary policies of all churches.

Wherever he went the author found a rising tide of race consciousness and a feeling of a growing solidarity in the races of color. As a result it can be said that "the white man has trouble everywhere" (Gandhi). The men of color are moving out to a new day; all we of the white race can do is help direct their steps. They need such direction for, in the words of Woodrow Wilson, it is one thing to win independence and another thing what to do with it. Are their old gods and faiths (Buddhism e.g.) sufficient for the task of liberation and reconstruction? Are new economic programs (Communism) adequate to the hour? Some think help will come by adopting ways of force. If nations follow the military example of Japan the old shackles of inferiority will break. Show the world you can fight and the nations will respect you. Christianity if it is to substantiate its claim to be the religion for all the world, must give up the attitude of the superiority of the white race. It is a fundamental implication of the gospel that all individuals and all races are alike before God, alike in their need and alike in their responsiveness to the divine remedy.

Of the lands visited by the author we are most directly interested in India. The general conclusions to which he comes concerning this people, are in accord with those of the writer of "Mother India." The misery of the Indian masses is a product of their very faith. 85 percent are in dire need. India is the world's oldest and most desperate human tragedy. The practise of the Hindu faith is tolerance and renunciation. All existence is illusion after all, man's task is to sink his individual self with its ills, hopes and aspirations in the deity. The losing of personal consciousness in Nirvana, annihilation, leads to spiritual liberty and bliss. This attitude relieves the Hindu of all responsibility towards his fellows. The mystic lives on the "high plateau of spiritual battles" and across the hedge live the masses in squalid huts. Our religion, says the Hindu, is communion with God, that and nothing more. The caste separates the India of culture from the India of poverty. Concern for one's fellow is unnecessary because its practise is unlawful. Hinduism has neither had the ideal nor the incarnation of a good Samaritan.

Indian lecturers come to our country and counter our own charges with a description of the evils of American life. Doubtless these evils are there but they overstate their case by making a comparison of American exceptions with the Indian rule.

Industrialism is gaining ground in India, inspite of Gandhi and his spinning wheel. It is opposed by Indian leaders not so much on account of its perils to Indians but because it comes from Britain and endangers its caste structure. Its evil effects, though undeniable, could never even approximate the native social abuses, as for instance the rapacity of the Zemindar (village owner), who charges interest rates from 75 percent upward.

India needs the gospel for it is first the good news of divine love, and then news of the good life of human love that lifts the burden from the others.

China is in turmoil. Civil wars are sapping the resources of the country, millions are starving. The work of the missionaries is hampered everywhere, many of them have been recalled, much of missionary property is destroyed. Nationalism is the vital force today, the land is trying to consolidate and to wrest its freedom from the Western powers. The missionaries, being more or less identified with the nations of the West, share in the general feeling of antagonism to outside influence and control.

Is the case of Christianity hopeless under these circumstances? No, says the author, Christianity's assets in China today are China's Christians; its strength is constituted from the testimony of their lives. The Chinese Christian community is overwhelmingly nationalist, but they hold enthusiastically to the opinion that the present movement has in it more of hope for China and the Christian Church in China than any development since the coming of the first missionaries more than a century ago.

Great administrative changes are called for. They can now be made in the full consciousness that Christianity in China has become indigenous; that, tried in the fire of persecution, China's Christians have refused to recant and have dared to testify.

In a concluding chapter the writer raises the general question, why do we go out to the heathen world when there is so much to be Christianized at home? His answer is: 1) there is the N. T. precedent: the Jews went out to the pagan world although the situation at home was bad enough. 2) The Christian faith finds restoration and enrichment in the lives of new Christians who have arisen on the foreign field. Not only the Christianizing of the world but the revitalizing of Christianity is involved in the future of foreign missions. We in America have become uncertain in our faith. The intellectual challenge from the world of science has unsettled the faith in many. This challenge has been met by Christian apologists. Still, many remain unconvinced and, what is still worse, many more have become religiously indifferent. In the midst of plenty and surrounded by so many agencies for relief, our need does not seem so pressing. The world is beautiful and life is interesting; millions do not feel they need a "Saviour."

In heathen lands the situation is so different. What great news to them the message of the fatherhood of God; the interest of Christ

in the individual, in his poverty, misery, his religious need. Here the outcastes, at least, feel is hope not only for the salvation of the individual but for the reorganization of human society. And the new Christians have experiences of joy and liberation, they use the means of grace as Western Christians hardly ever do. They put new life into the churches of old Christian lands which carry on such missionary labors; they pay back a hundredfold the efforts and means expended in sending the gospel to them. There is an attitude abroad in the Western world that is tolerant of all faiths, that professes to believe that Buddha is just as good for Buddhists as Christ is for Christians. A person only has to go to the lands of Buddha, says the author, to be convinced more strongly than ever that there is only one name given by which we might be saved, the name of Jesus Christ.

This last chapter is especially valuable and impressive. The whole book, however, is so well written; it shows so much careful observation; it is so replete with abundant illustration; it is so fair and sympathetic that it makes exceedingly good and helpful reading. We take pleasure in bringing it to the attention of our readers.

Restlessness and Reality, by *Geo. A. Miller* (a bishop of the M. E. Church). The Abingdon Press, 1929. 183 pages, $1.00.

This little book is written for people who feel that they are missing something at the heart of life. "We do our best to keep up with the new inventions and interests, and sometimes we read the latest books; but in spite of all that motor cars, radios, movies, and the 'best sellers' can do for us, we are restless at heart." In the drive and whirl of life how are we to attain satisfying contacts with spiritual reality? Our lives are full of surface values, but life consists not in outward possessions. There is hope in the very dissatisfactions of the age. The flood of new books on religion, with their discussions on the theology, philosophy, psychology, apologetics and mechanics of religion, show that people are turning to something else than noise and speed as a cure for the discontentment of their souls.

Our restlessness is not caused by a lack of material things, for never had the world more to offer in the things our senses crave. Excitement, thrills, social climbing, "playing with fire" will be poor substitutes for real soul food. Nor will all kinds of fads, midnight séances, the gift of tongues, listening to Hindu Suamis furnish the key into the realm of peace and certainty. Institutionalism has its value in the mechanics of the life of the spirit. Without question High Mass in the cathedral makes an impact on our consciousness never to be forgotten. "It looks like reality itself, and its combination of mystery, magic, and material substance forms one of the most powerful psychological appeals ever made to the human mind. Clothe a man with all this panoply of power and prestige and it is not strange that men will drop the hard search for direct relations with God and gratefully accept the priestly absolution as a welcome sub-

stitute." But what all seekers of an immediate awareness of the ultimate reality need is that they keep on good terms with God, cultivating a good conscience and practising fellowship with him.

The writer has the gift of speaking to the modern man in modern terms. Living in the twentieth century and not in the first, as even the eighteenth, he employs the inventions of the time as illustrations for his message. For instance, the radio. He says, under "Listening in": "We improve our 'reception' mainly by paying attention to it. Read the most helpful books, listen to and talk with the men and women who seem to have a meaning and message for us, practice daily tuning in, keep forever at the elimination of whatever interferes with our reception. Follow the radio rules of the spirit and you will get results. God is on the air, all the time. Everything that comes in on my receiver and speaks to my innermost spirit was sent from somewhere. The Voice comes from Headquarters and it speaks of a loving Will and Intelligent Purpose."

You ask the bishop *how* he knows. He replies, "Partly because I know I know (by intuition, inner awareness), and partly because my results check with those of other and better men than I, and partly because what I hear with the inner ear has close likeness to the mind of Christ."

The motor car furnishes him with another parable for the spiritual. "The inner energy that drives the car along, like that which motivates our living, is hidden from sight, an independent power-unit, detachable in operation at will from the car itself. All hope of a successful journey depends on this inner energy-producer, and it is well to know something of the laws of its operation. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." "If we neglect our spiritual motors and wait to pray for help till our calamity is upon us, we may find our resources failing us. If our motors are to be ready for instant service at all times, it is absolutely necessary to spend more time in prayer and contemplation with no reference whatever to immediate necessities. An effective prayer-motor needs daily use and frequent testings and occasional overhaulings to keep it in order. The aeroplane is a fitting symbol of the soul's reach towards reality. "Faith that lays hold on the eternal actualities is like the flight of the heavier-than-air machines. It swings out on nothing visible, sustained by its own inner energies. It is automatically self-sustaining by its own upward lift and rises heavenward without visible means of support". (Here the bishop seems momentarily to forget that this upward life is conditioned by the forward motion of the motor and the pressure of the air against the wings). "The dangerous part of flying is the starting and stopping. When our spirits step off into the unknown with confidence enough in the God of the infinite spaces and mysterious realms of the eternal energies, we find that we are more than merely out of danger; we are launched into a new universe with possibilities undreamed of on the lower levels of authoritative certainty."

The writer is not fond of those who wear their heart on their sleeves and expect the same of others, greeting them with, "How is your soul today, brother?" Or of emotional devotees, like the one who told him that her wayward daughter "day before yesterday took salvation, yesterday she took sanctification, and this morning she took healing—hallelujah." Subsequent events indicated, he says, that all three had been bad "takes."

He is no friend of dogmatic controversies. Every one who finds in Christ the creator of a new personality, and possessing the love of God and of man, is brother to him. Christ is the objective standard for our subjective concept of God. "Here we are on solid ground, dealing with a historical person incontestably certified by good witnesses and far-reaching results explainable on no other grounds than that Jesus lived, died and rose for our redemption." "There is a necessary divine co-ordination of these two revelations of God, the Word spoken through Christ and the Spirit manifested in me. God becomes his own self-interpreter, through the things of Christ."

To sum up, man becomes conscious of ultimate reality by using, exercising his spiritual sense to get into fellowship with the world of the spirit. That here he comes in contact with a personal Intelligence and a loving Heart, he realizes by intuition, by personal experience. This experience he shares with generations of Christians. The highest sanction for his faith, he finds in Jesus Christ: in him is peace, joy, power, life, fellowship, certainty.

The bishop does not appear before us in the heavy panoply of philosophical terminology. His book is not written so much for the intellectual doubters, but for those who are dissatisfied with the indifference and uncertainty of the average man. The Christian faith is described more than proved by argument. The book contains a practical apologetic of great persuasiveness.

We have quoted freely from the text, especially its illustrations. Here the critic is a great master and we are sure our readers will be grateful to us for our giving his ipsissima verba.

Sunday in the Making. A Historical and Critical Study of the Sabbath Principle in Inheritance and Development by *Chas. N. Huestis.* The Abingdon Press, 1929. 256 pages. $2.00.

The author is, or was, the secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance of Canada and as such might be expected to take a narrow and legalistic view of the Sabbath. This is by no means the case. He considers the Sabbath fundamental in the religious and even the social life of the people, but his attitude towards the scripture is far from narrow Fundamentalism. He calls the story, in Numbers, of the man who was stoned, by the command of God, because he was found gathering sticks on the Sabbath, a horrible one, perhaps inserted by the priestly compilers of the books of the O. T. He also recognizes that some of the religious institutions of Israel, if not all, originated outside its own borders, were taken over and remolded by the Jews, under the guiding influence of its men of God.

So e.g. the Sabbath. He leans to the view that the institution of the Sabbath can be traced back to the Canaanites or the remote ancestors of the Semitic race (the common opinion is that it may have been borrowed from the Babylonians, we think). The post-exilic Jewish nation was very strict in its Sabbath observance. The day came to be observed with the sole regard to its divine appointment. It was hedged about with many burdensome restrictions, so that it was more an infliction than a blessing.

Jesus, therefore, made the Jewish Sabbath one of the chief points of attack. He restored its original human feature, that it had been designed as a day of recreation, joy and spiritual exercises; that it was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. His critical attitude on the Sabbath was one of the main causes of the hostility of the Jewish leaders.

The ticklish question, "What right had the church to change the Sabbath to Sunday, the Lord's day?" he answers by saying, the church in this followed its Christian conscience and intelligence guided by the Holy Spirit. The name, "Sunday," is of heathen origin, but to object to it on that account would be just as reasonable as to refuse to use the names of the days of the week, all of them having a mythological ancestry.

The author now traces the history of the development of the Lord's Day down from Constantine to the Middle Ages and the times of the Reformation. He discusses the Continental and the English Sunday; he leads up finally to the Sabbath idea in modern life.

The Sabbath is not to be kept simply because it was commanded in the 4th commandment. The decalogue as a Jewish institution is abrogated, according to Paul (Luther's position is also stated and approved). If it is still to be observed it is because of an eternal need of man for recurring periods of rest and meditation. The Sabbath teaches us the right kind of leisure. It affords time and mood for reflection; the inner life of the individual and the highest needs of society require its preservation.

The observance of Sunday is the concern of both the state and the church. The work of the state is negative. All it can do is to afford such quiet and leisure on Sunday as is necessary for worship. "To substitute inner sanctions and inhibitions for outer authority based on force is perhaps the greatest need of our day. Religion perishes as soon as constraint, the fear of man, or politics come into play."

It is an interesting book on an important subject. The writer has given his theme years of study. His position is sane, his judgment well balanced and his conclusions are founded securely. The Lord's Day Alliance of Canada seems to be better advised than the same body here has sometimes been.

CONTENTS OF THE YEAR 1929

JANUARY

How to Preach the Social Gospel, Prof. Ph. Vollmer 1
Christianity and the Industrial Classes, Prof. H. Niebuhr 12
Modernism, Rev. H. Vieth 19
Schöpfungsglaube und Naturwissenschaft. Prof. R. Grützmacher 22
Braucht die Kirche ein Bekenntnis? Pastor G. Schuetze 31
Editorials 41
Christian World 49
Book Review 68

MARCH

Ministry and Ordination, Dr. J. O. Evjen 81
Important Missionary Development, Dr. P. A. Menzel 97
Modern Bible Translations, Dr. H. Schick 105
Erhaltung, Vorsehung, Wunder. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher 112
Die Parusie. Pastor E. Schweizer 122
Editorials 130
Christian World 138
Book Review 149

MAY

The Creation Story, Theo. Haas 161
Ministry and Ordination, Prof. Dr. Evjen 168
G. E. Lessing. Pastor Dr. E. Schieler 185
Seelenglaube. Prof. Dr. Grützmacher 195
Evangelisation. Pastor W. Rath 204
Editorials 210
Christian World 218
Book Review 228

JULY

The Creation Story, Theo. Haas 241
Christian Thought and Modern Life, H. Vieth 249
Economic Ethics, A. Ruecker 256
Ministry and Ordination, Dr. O. Evjen 265
Christentum und Geschichte. Dr. H. R. Grützmacher 278
Die Reformierte Kirche. E. G. Aldinger 288
Editorals 298
Christian World 303
Book Review 309

SEPTEMBER

Divine Sovereignty, Dr. Geo. Richards 321
The Contemplated Merger, Rev. O. Flohr 331
Ministry and Ordination, Dr. J. Evjen 338
Luthers Katechismus. Dr. E. Schieler 348
Christentum und Erkenntnistheorie. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher 354
Erwiderung. Pastor H. Niedernhoefer 363
Editorials 375
Christian World 382
Book Review 387